

METHODIST REVIEW.

(PUBLISHED MONTHLY.)

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, L.H.D., Editor.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. John Fletcher Hurst. <i>Professor J. A. Paulkner, D.D., Drexel Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.</i>	345
II. The Climax of Human History. <i>Bishop H. W. Warren, D.D., LL.D., University Park, Pa.</i>	357
III. The New Emphasis on Religious Experience. <i>William MacMullen, D.D., New York City, N. Y.</i>	369
IV. A Modern Theory of Mind. <i>President Samuel Plantz, D.D., Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.</i>	382
V. The Passing of a Generation. <i>Professor A. D. Armstrong, Ph.D., Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.</i>	397
VI. The Level of Prophecy in Babylon's and in Palestine. <i>Professor Edward König, LL.D., University of Bonn, Germany.</i>	409
VII. The Value of the Study of Science for Ministers. <i>B. M. Vernon, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.</i>	424
VIII. Episcopal Supervision for Missions. <i>J. E. Scott, D.D., Rajahmundry, India.</i>	435
IX. The English May Meetings. <i>Rev. H. W. Horvill, M.A., New York City, N. Y.</i>	441
X. The Coronation of the Common People. <i>William Harrison, D.D., Dorchester, New Brunswick, Canada.</i>	445
EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:	
Notes and Discussions.	448
As Incurable Blunder in Grammar, 448; The Bible Society Centennial, 449.	
The Arena.	463
Man Greater than Nature, 463; The Revival in Church and College, 463; "An Educated Ministry" Again, 463; Saint Paul on the Obedient Body.—A Rejoinder, 467; Ministerial Swearing, 468.	
The Itinerants' Club.	469
Paul's Advice to Titus—Titus II, 11-13, 469.	
Archæology and Biblical Research.	473
Deltische and His Critics, 473.	
Foreign Outlook.	478
Glimpses of Reviews and Magazines.	488
Book Notices.	491

NEW YORK:
EATON & MAINS.
CINCINNATI:
JENNINGS & PYLE.

Subscription Price, Postage Included, \$2.50.

[Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]

The Conflict of Truth.

By F. HUGH CAPRON, B.A., F.R.A.S.

Mr. Herbert Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy* has dwarfed all preceding philosophical systems. Few who have given the subject a thought will deny to Mr. Spencer's work a place in the very foremost rank of human productions; and for this reason, if for no other, the question of its bearing upon the great religious controversy must necessarily be one of transcendent importance.

It appears to me that Mr. Spencer has furnished to the world the most powerful argument in support of the truth of the Bible, and I shall attempt to demonstrate by a comparison of certain portions of the Bible with corresponding passages in the *Synthetic Philosophy*, that the doctrines of Revealed Religion rest upon the surest foundations known to science; and the novelty of my method will consist in this—that I shall argue that the Bible is to be believed, not because Mr. Spencer is wrong, but because he is right.

—Extract from Preface.

8vo, 509 pages. Cloth, \$2.50.

Ohio, New Jersey, and Kentucky

have adopted, and as soon as their annual conventions occur all the other important Sunday School Associations will adopt.

Teacher-Training for the Sunday School.

By REV. CHARLES ROADS, D.D.

Teacher-Training for the Sunday School is full of suggestions for wide-awake superintendents and teachers who are not quite sure that they know it all. Dr. Roads has had long experience and therefore is enabled to say what he thinks with refreshing consciousness, always definite and to the point. It could be studied at home or be made the basis of work for a class in teaching.

—The Churchman.

Pocket card covers, 25 cents, net; by mail, 25 cents.

Five Hundred Thousand Young People

Gladly anticipate the arrival of these Bright and Attractive Weekly Visitors

THE CLASSMATE.

Beautifully illustrated, and every line of its entertaining, instructive, and popular contents will be read with interest by the young people, and their elders will also enjoy it. Single copy, 75 cents a year; in clubs of six or over to one address, 50 cents each.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL ADVOCATE.

Issued in a new form. Eight pages. Printed in bright colors. Holds fast to its long-established reputation as the freshest, finest, and best paper for the younger people. Single copy, 40 cents a year; in clubs of six or over to one address, 25 cents each.

EATON & MAINS, Publishers, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York.
JENNINGS & PYE, Cincinnati, O.



John F. Hurst

METHODIST REVIEW.

MAY, 1904.

ART. I.—JOHN FLETCHER HURST.

JOHN FLETCHER HURST was born in or near Salem, Dorchester County, Maryland, August 17, 1834, and died at Bethesda, Maryland, May 4, 1903. He came from an old Dorchester County family. His grandfather, Samuel Hurst (1765-1822), served in the Thirty-ninth Maryland Regiment in the Revolutionary War, 1781-83. His father, Elijah Hurst (1797-1849), who brought up his children in the fear of the Lord, was a diligent and successful farmer, of whom the anecdote is related that when the Cambridge (Md.) Methodist Episcopal church was built and dedicated he subscribed twenty-five dollars each for his two children, and then hesitated about his own subscription; then the pastor's eye caught that of Farmer Thompson, who shouted, "I'll give ten dollars more than 'Lije Hurst." "Make my subscription two hundred dollars," said Hurst. Thompson was thunderstruck, but manfully paid his two hundred and ten dollars. Elijah was one of the shrewdest farmers in that whole section, and owned at one time one thousand acres. It was from him his son inherited his business instincts and his wonderful administrative talents. The mother, Ann Colston (1808-41), possessed a beautiful spirit and a fine intellect; from her he inherited his literary gifts and wide sympathies. Elijah's only other child married Dr. John F. Kurtz, in the same county, and died in 1886. The famous merchant millionaire of Baltimore, John E. Hurst (1832-1904), was a cousin of the bishop, being the second son of his father's brother Stephen.



Our subject, who was a model youth, told the story of his conversion in a most interesting way to the Northwest Indiana Conference in 1889:

I have been trying to serve God now ever since the year 1853; that is about thirty-six years. I had no parents—they were gone home, to heaven—and I was among strangers. My mother died before I was seven years old, so that I don't remember even her face fully—just a mere outline. I think I will know it; I think I will recognize it when the fight is over and when the happy meetings come, never to separate. My father was a Christian man and died when I was fourteen. I was going home from a little debating society, pretty late at night, and on the other side of the street, as I was going toward my boarding place, I heard them singing in the Methodist church. With me was a young school companion who afterward entered the ministry. We went over into the meeting and crowded well to the front. The minister saw us and came down and spoke to me, and asked me if I didn't want to go to heaven. We both went to the altar, and time after time, meeting after meeting. I was seeking light all the time; trying to do something, trying to perform some obligation, trying to understand Him, and when I came to see that I could not understand anything He gave me light. One night, going home from church, I remember that a change came over me; a light broke out before me; there was a little river in the distance, and it seemed to shine like silver; I didn't know what it all was; I thought it was some sudden glow of good feeling. I went to my room full of joy, and the Lord revealed to me, "You have a new heart." The Lord had given it to me; there was no consciousness of sin. I felt, like the Pilgrim, that the burden had fallen from my shoulders. I could now lose it because I had gotten to the foot of the cross, and I have been trying to serve the Lord ever since. I have been thankful to him that the change was so sudden, so striking; that I have been able to look back upon it as the hour when God, for Christ's sake, spoke peace to my soul. Now and then a cloud comes. I am not satisfied. I want the sunlight ever here. Our privileges are infinitely greater than we think they are; we can do more for God; religion can be more of a joy, instead of a mere service and hard task beneath the hot sun.

The preacher who led him to Christ was James A. Brindle, who, with Henry Colclazer, was pastor of Cambridge Circuit, Snow-Hill District, Maryland, then the Philadelphia Conference, who were holding meetings at Cambridge in the winter of 1849-50. Brindle died in 1894 after a long, faithful, consecrated, and efficient ministry. To him Bishop Hurst pays a glowing tribute in the *Peninsula Methodist* of April 28, 1894. The man who accompanied Hurst to the altar on that eventful night was Benjamin Douglas Dashiell of the Methodist Episcopal Church,

South (cousin to Missionary Secretary Robert L. Dashiell). After a self-sacrificing ministry as pastor and presiding elder in Texas he died in January, 1882, aged about fifty-two years.

Even before this time young Hurst had thoughts of the ministry, and when, in 1843 or 1844, the corner stone of a new church in Cambridge, Maryland, was laid he deposited in it a coin, with his name, and told his schoolmates that he would some day preach in that church—which he did. John Fletcher Hurst was a student from boyhood. After attending school in his own neighborhood he went to the academy at Cambridge, the building of which is still standing on Academy Street. Besides mastering the work at school he would steal away to some quiet nook in the woods or along the shore and pore over books in history. Then came the question of college. The words of Bishop Hurst himself at the funeral of Bishop Peck cannot be quoted too often, as they show how a word spoken at the proper time may mark the turning point of a life:

My mind goes back from this hour many years—over the chasm of a generation, thirty-three years. Away down in the south of Maryland, on the eastern slope of the Chesapeake, when attending a camp meeting I was told that the president of Dickinson College was to preach on a certain day. Such a sermon was seldom heard in that peninsula. Some one had said "college" to me a few times before this, and I had thought of taking a college education, but this seemed well-nigh impossible. I remember a kind preacher brought me to the preacher of the afternoon. I told him something about going to college. Said he: "Don't trouble yourself. Go home and wait until the opening of the term, and then take the stage across by York and come there and I will meet you, and we will live happily together." And for two years I was a student under him. When Dr. Collins succeeded him I remained two years; but no tender heart beat more keenly in sympathy with the student than his. The friend of schools from the Atlantic to the Pacific! So I think of him as a man who took a boy by the hand. And ever since the memories of the man have been precious.

There is nothing to be specially remarked about his college life (1850-54). A fellow-student remarks of him that he was "gentle, quiet, with a certain reserve and dignity. He was an industrious student and came to the recitation room well prepared. In disposition he was cheerful but not hilarious, and while he appreciated fun I never knew him to be in anything which trans-

gressed the rules of the college." The life at the college showed the effects of his home training and the strength of his moral and religious principles. Another classmate (the Rev. D. J. Holmes) says, "I once heard Professor Goodrich say, 'Tell me what a young man is in college and I will tell you what he will be in the world.' This was eminently true of John Hurst." He was a plodder; a diligent, earnest student. He was a member of the Union Philosophical Society (no secret or Greek letter fraternities were allowed in the college at that time), and entered enthusiastically into its literary and debating work. His classmate, General Rusling, says that he read widely outside of his curriculum, being in history and general literature the best read man in his class. "I remember his favorite books were Grote's Greece and Hume's England, and he never wearied of descanting on the excellencies of both. He was especially fond of composition, and took Grote, Hume, and Macaulay as his models, and was the best writer in our class." Rusling adds that in college he was always the quiet scholar and Christian gentleman, the synonym of uprightness and integrity.

After teaching a few months at Greensboro, Maryland, he accepted an invitation to the Hedding Literary Institute, Ashland, Greene County, New York, where he taught languages, literature, and also chemistry.* In 1856 he resolved on theological study abroad and went to Halle and Heidelberg, where his studies were much interrupted by long foot journeys over large parts of Europe, including England. Impressions of some of these years, as well as his later European life, are found in his *Life and Literature of the Fatherland*. Returning to America toward the close of 1857 he applied for a license to preach at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and served that circuit with Samuel B. Dunlap and Richard Norris. Finding his contemplated marriage would keep him out of the old Baltimore Conference, which seemed to stick to the rigorous old Wesleyan rules, he applied to the new Newark Conference (organized in 1856) at its session at Morristown in 1858. His first appointment was Irvington, New Jersey. Here in May,

* It is singular that the late Dr. A. W. Cummings omits reference to this Institute in his *Invaluable Schools of Methodism*.

1859, he married Miss Charlotte Elizabeth Lamont, daughter of Dr. William Lamont, of Charlotteville, New York, one of the most noble and accomplished ladies that ever presided in a Methodist parsonage. Her devotion, her sympathy, her tact, her fine accomplishments, were ever laid on the altar of her home. An artist, a linguist, a woman of literary culture, she yet gave herself freely to the duties of domestic life, and to her devoted helpfulness her husband owed no small measure of his success. A little shelf of inspiring books is the result of her knowledge of foreign languages, literary skill, and sympathetic understanding of Christian life in different ages and countries: *Renata of Este: A Chapter from the History of the Reformation in France and Italy* (translated), 1873; *Queen Louisa of Prussia*, from German sources, 1874; *Elizabeth Christine*, wife of Frederick the Great, from German and other sources, 1880; and others, all published by the Methodist Book Concern. With tragic suddenness this beautiful and gracious spirit was taken from her home in Washington, D. C., March 14, 1890. Of this happy marriage there were born six children: John Lamont, of Denver; Clara, who was laid to rest in the beautiful Friedhof at Frankfort-on-the-Main amid the flowers brought by the loving hands of her little German school-mates, aged seven years, June 23, 1869; Carl Bailey, recently chief consul at Vienna; the delicate and loving Blanche, who died in Buffalo, 1885, aged eleven years; Helen; and Paul, lieutenant in the Philippine Islands. Bishop Hurst's pastorates in the Newark Conference were as follows: 1858, Irvington, N. J.; 1859-60, Passaic; 1861-62, Elizabeth, Fulton Street; 1863-64, Elizabeth, Water Street; 1865-66, Staten Island, Trinity. On June 6, 1866, he received, and after repeated solicitation accepted, September 20, an appointment as theological tutor in the Mission Institute, Bremen, to succeed William F. Warren, the able theologian and scholar who was to take charge of the educational enterprise which the liberality of Jacob Sleeper and Isaac Rich had set on foot in Boston. The story of the voyage of himself and family over the ocean and their establishment in Bremen is told in the first chapter of his fascinating book already referred to. In 1867-68 Dr. Hurst (he had received the degree of D.D. from

Dickinson in 1866) taught in Bremen, and in 1868 to 1871 did the same service for the young German Methodist preachers at the Martin Mission Institute, Frankfort-on-the-Main—founded by the munificence of John T. Martin, Esq., of Brooklyn, as a part of the centennial movement and formally opened January 17, 1869—during his vacations studying German life and traveling in Europe and in the East; visiting the Holy Land in 1871.

Before he embarked for his work in Bremen the Messrs. Scribner published his *History of Rationalism*, which the Methodist Book Concern also indirectly took up. This book, the only one of scientific importance which he found time to write, made him well known in the learned world, and it has great and permanent value. This was followed by three important books which he translated—"all crowded into three years," said his wife: Professor Hagenbach, *Church History of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, 2 vols. (Scribners, 1869); Professor J. J. Von Oosterzee, *John's Gospel: Apologetical Lectures*, published by T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1869; and Professor Lange, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Scribners, 1869). In the Hagenbach he had the assistance of his friend and brother Marylander of the adjoining Talbot County, Professor Bernard Harrison Nadal, who while pastor of Trinity Church, Philadelphia, and later, rendered chapters i-vii, ix, and part of x, Volume I, and parts of xvi, xvii of Volume II. Hurst added (II, 456-479) an excellent chapter on the "Most Recent History and Present State of the Church in Europe." This book was printed in Germany and the stereotyped plates sent to New York. The beautiful and learned work on John's gospel by the Utrecht professor was translated in Bremen and Frankfort, printed in Berlin, and published in Edinburgh. The translator added a few notes, an excellent preface, a valuable list of books on John's gospel, and an index. It remains still one of the best books in defense of the Fourth Gospel, written with fine spiritual insight. The translation of Lange's Romans, a work of great difficulty, won the praise of the general editor, Professor Schaff. Valuable homiletical material was added, drawn from the full sources of English practical theology. When Whedon noticed this book (January, 1870, p.

130) it offended him that the Arminian contribution was confined exclusively to the mechanical part. "Arminian Dr. Hurst is allowed to do the machine work of translation and gathering of homiletical scraps; but he is safely put under keepers, and in the commentary itself no Arminian is allowed to say a word." But that gives Whedon all the better opportunity to say something, and what he does say let those who are so fortunate as to possess a file of the *Review* read for themselves.

The death, in 1870, of Professor Nadal made a vacancy in the chair of historical theology at Drew, for which Hurst urged Charles W. Bennett, recently a student at Berlin and, later, historical professor at Syracuse and at Garrett. The trustees elected Hurst himself, which compelled him to leave his loved Germans at Frankfort-on-the-Main and take up English again as a vehicle of instruction. He came back in 1871, and by the fall of that year was at work in the old northeast room in Mead Hall, where many of those who read these lines will remember his interesting lectures and even more interesting discursions into bypaths of history, biography, and literature. In 1873, when Professor Foster had been elected bishop, Professor Hurst was elected president of the seminary. The first work he published after his return was *Martyrs to the Tract Cause: A Contribution to the History of the Reformation* (Methodist Book Concern, 1872). This small book is really one of the most valuable of those which bear his name. When he was ransacking an old bookshop at Frankfort, in 1870, under the shadow of the house where Goethe was born, he came across the *Martyrer der Traktatsache*, by Otto Thelemann, published on its fiftieth anniversary by the Wupperthal Tract Society, organized at Barmen in 1814. Partly as a translation of this, and partly with additions of his own, he made one of our most interesting brief contributions to church history. This was followed by outlines of Bible and Church History, 1873 and 1874, intended for Bible and normal classes (the Methodist Book Concern). The next contained the rich fruit of his studies, travels, and observations in Germany—*Life and Literature in the Fatherland* (Scribners, 1875). Few books equal it in breadth of view and accuracy; racy, interesting as a novel, full of the keen and genial

observations of one who had the true instincts of a traveler. His next book was *Our Theological Century: A Contribution to the History of Theology in the United States* (Randolph, 1877, 70 pp.). It is a rapid general survey of the ecclesiastical and theological drift of the United States and of its providential position in history, dwelling with special power and pleasure on that divine arrangement which made the United States Protestant, and not Roman Catholic. The pivotal matters of our history are touched on with skill. This was followed by a work compiled mostly by his pupils, notably George Blood Smythe, *Bibliotheca Theologica: A Bibliography of Theology* (Scribners, 1883)—a list of books in English on all the topics in theology, with full titles, notes, publishers, prices, etc., with admirable indices. A complete working over of this useful book was intrusted to the hands of Professor George W. Gilmore, of Bangor Theological Seminary, later of Meadville Theological Seminary, and the result—really a new book (xv, 575)—was *Literature of Theology: A Classified Bibliography of General Religious Literature* (Methodist Book Concern, 1895), and a remarkably full and accurate list of books in English in all departments of theology. It is indispensable to all libraries, bibliographers, and earnest workers in theological fields. An evidence of its completeness is the fact that the Rev. Albert Osborn's admirable index of authors occupies fifty-eight double-columned octavo pages.

Not the least important of Professor Hurst's work at Drew was his recovery of the endowment. When the late Daniel Drew built the seminary at Madison he kept in his own hands the \$250,000 of endowment for current expenses, paying interest regularly. This was against his own judgment and wish, as he had more than once proposed to the trustees to pay the money into their hands. The event proved the wisdom of his thought. In 1875 or 1876 his investments were destroyed in the stock exchange by a younger manipulator of consummate skill, and the great and benevolent financier went out in his old age a broken man. The question arose, Shall the seminary be abandoned, or shall its endowment be recovered by an appeal to the Church? Not one of the faculty, though without salaries, had any thought of leaving. They threw

the school on the heart of the Church, and nobly she responded. President Hurst left his library, his lecture room, his family, went here and there all over the Eastern States, visiting churches, preaching, representing the seminary, visiting men and women of wealth, in all of which he was ably seconded by Professor (now President) Buttz, and, thanks to the generous responses of the Church, the lost endowment was more than recovered. What years of work were those, 1876-79! He would come back for a breathing space, take his classes for a little time out of the hands of the ever ready and willing Professor Kidder—*venerabile nomen*—give a great address in the chapel calling the students to a life of utter devotion to the Church, and then off again to his task; perhaps to Europe, as when he attended the Evangelical Alliance at Basel, in 1879, and delivered his able address in German on Christian Union, published in English, revised and enlarged, by the Methodist Book Concern in 1880 (*Christian Union Necessary for Religious Progress and Defense*, 35 pp.); a satisfying paper, illuminated with lights from his wide reading and softened by the catholicity of his large spirit. In connection with his Drew life must be mentioned the launching of an important literary enterprise, the Biblical and Theological Library, in which Methodist scholars should provide books in all departments written with scientific completeness and accuracy. Splendid results have already been attained in the noble volumes of this Crooks and Hurst series, though our view of them is saddened with the thought that some of those who were assigned work were carried off by death—Professor Latimer, of Boston School of Theology; Professor Winchell, of the University of Michigan; Professor Ridgaway, of Garrett, and, finally, Professor Crooks himself, whose *History of Doctrine* is left to another hand.

In 1880 Professor Hurst was made bishop. He entered upon his duties with zest and love. His residences were Des Moines, 1880-84; Buffalo, 1884-88; Washington, 1888-1903. He held the European Conferences in 1884, those in India in 1884-85, and the European again in 1885. As a result of his visit in India we have a most valuable book on that country, richly illustrated, as interesting and with the same wealth of general knowledge as his book

on Germany—*Indika: The Country and the People of India and Ceylon* (Harpers, 1891). In this age of process print illustrations it is refreshing to look upon the wood engravings in this portly volume. All phases of Indian life, civilization, and religion are treated, with notes, tables, maps, etc. For the Chautauqua course he prepared a few little books in Church history: *The Early Church*, 1886; *The Mediæval Church*, 1887; *The Reformation*, 1885; *The Modern Church*, 1888, and *The Church in the United States*, 1890. These were afterward published in one volume with the title, *Short History of the Christian Church* (Harpers, 1893). Bishop Hurst took great interest in the Ecumenical Conference of 1891, where his address of welcome was a notable and never-to-be-forgotten feature; parts of it spoken in the different languages represented by the Conference—English, French, Italian, German, etc. At the Conference in London, in 1901, his health was beginning to fail, and especially the news concerning President McKinley prostrated him, but parts of his addresses there display the old-time beauty, breadth of view, and pertinency of thought and language. It had been his almost lifelong aim to write a history of the Church, and while professor at Drew he had prepared it up to the time of Charles the Great; but the absorbing work and dissipating details of the episcopate made impossible its completion by himself. He had also planned an elaborate and richly illustrated *History of Methodism*, to be completed in about ten volumes, each country to be written by some one acquainted with its history, and the whole illustrated lavishly from all available sources.

And now we come to his last work: the founding of the American University. A national university had been proposed at Washington—thought of by Simpson, urged by William Arthur—but it was left to Hurst to realize the dream. That a man of sixty should plan this vast scheme, buy ninety-one acres of land, raise the \$100,000 to pay for it, and, in the midst of multitudinous affairs that took up all of mind and heart as well as bodily strength, carry the scheme through to the extent of having one building finished, another under way, about \$1,150,000 endowment and other resources pledged, of which \$500,000 has been paid in, see

the university indorsed by the General Conferences of the two Churches in the United States—where has a picture like that been seen in the history of the world! What courage, what faith, what vision, what endurance! The land was bought in 1890, paid for by 1895, the university incorporated in 1891, the Hall of History built in 1896-98, and the corner stone of the Hall of Government laid May 14, 1902. The university is to be purely post-graduate, intended to cap the educational structure of our Church. The Roman Catholic prelates, with their usual sagacity, had already seen the immense importance of Washington as an educational center, and in 1889 opened there a great university. With the vast resources of the capital thrown open free to students—its archives, its museums, its libraries—the American University could perhaps shortly open its halls to our young men in a few courses—say history and political economy—leading to the degrees of M.A. and Ph.D. Will the Church prove true to this great trust?

At the bishops' meeting in Trenton, in 1901, Hurst was the guest of General Rusling, his college classmate. He writes thus to Registrar Osborn:

What a charming week that was! How delightful and suggestive along every human line! We talked and gossiped much each day, and . . . of course we talked much about the American University. It was then heavy on his heart, but clear in his mind, and he felt sure that it would "come to pass" duly. It had come to him, he said, as a "heavenly vision," and he had only "been obedient to it," and he felt sure God would yet carry it through; if not in his lifetime, then afterward. He longed to see it opened, and its halls thronged with young men and women—the best in America—and he confidently believed that God would order it all right, whatever happened to him. He was then feeble in health but strong in soul and purpose, and looked and talked as Moses or Elijah might have done in their last years.

It is the pathos of death that one must leave his work undone. What fields of knowledge to explore, what books to write, what good influences to start, what institutions of love or light to help or to found—but death touches the arm of the sculptor! So it was with our friend. Browning says:

There shall never be one lost good! What was shall live as before;
The evil is null, is naught, is silence implying sound;
What was good shall be good, with, for evil, so much good more;
On the earth the broken arcs; in the heaven a perfect round!

What is the historical significance of the life we have been considering? 1. He, with McClintock, Crooks, and a few others, was among the first to make known American Methodist scholarship to the English-speaking world; by the works which he wrote; by the Library of Biblical and Theological Literature edited by him and Dr. Crooks; indirectly by the presidency of the American Society of Church History, and—thanks to the earnest scholars whom he called to his aid—he permanently enlarged and deepened the range, the volume, and the quality of Methodist scholarship. 2. By his work in and for our schools he wrought himself into the intellectual fiber of our Church in a unique way. By his work in the saving of Drew he placed the Church under unending obligations. By his founding of a post-graduate university at Washington he marked out both the place where and the plan upon which the Church must inevitably take the next step in its educational progress if she is ever given the courage and self-sacrifice to follow the path of her farsighted leader.

Many will echo the greeting of his college and lifelong friend, General Rusling: "And so, John F. Hurst—good friend, brave heart, generous soul—hail and farewell! Surely in the hereafter—sometime, somewhere, somehow, as God wills—we shall meet and greet each other again, and part no more forever!"

A large, elegant handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "John F. Hurst". The signature is written in dark ink and features a prominent, sweeping initial "J" that extends upwards and to the left. The name "Hurst" is written in a fluid, connected style, ending with a long, horizontal flourish that extends to the right.

ART. II.—THE CLIMAX OF HUMAN HISTORY.

ACCENT the human. We seek to know what greatest things men have achieved unaided by a divine revelation and providential help. This will inevitably be associated with the meanest things. If the Creator and Upholder of the universe directly aids nations in matters of sanitary science, civil institutions, revelation of ideas undiscernible by themselves unaided, by expansion of mind, and by the more abundant spiritual life, there is no limit yet reached of things possible to men so aided. But up to the present there have been great national developments over continents and through centuries without what is understood as divine revelation and providential help. Where have they been the greatest? We would naturally say that greatness is indicated by possession of fertile soil, by the utilization of the forces of nature, by armies raised and wielded, by the arts of life, architecture, painting; also by the outgoing of mind in poetry and metaphysics, and the natural feeling after God in their human religions.

In asking where is the climax of human history we propose to pass by Babylon, Nineveh, Egypt, Greece, and even Rome, and present the claims of India for that distinction. In regard to a fitting field for vast empire it certainly has no rival. It is a triangle about fifteen hundred miles on a side, all inhabitable. The great Gangetic valley certainly has no equal in the world. One can go one thousand miles and never come to a hill. The vast range of the Himalayas at the north pours down a perpetual flood of fertile silt that is not approximated by the Mississippi or the Nile. Except for occasional drouths and consequent famines, about ten in a century in some parts of it, there is no place where the fecund earth offers to provide for such an abundant population. This desirable India has been coveted by all the great conquerors of the world. Nearly every student of Greek remembers how he entrancedly read of the wars of Darius five hundred years before Christ. Two centuries later came Alexander the Great, defeating King Porus and his vast hordes of men, horses, and elephants. How well we remember that the captured Porus

answered Alexander's question of how he wished to be treated, "As a king." Here Alexander heard of the kingdom of Magahda on the Ganges, whose sovereign, Sandrocottus, could bring into the field an army of six hundred thousand men, three hundred thousand horses, and nine thousand elephants. Mohammedan prowess sought to possess itself of India through Persia, which had been previously conquered. The sacking of cities and the slaughters of men and women were incredibly savage through the centuries, till Mahmoud of Shizni came in 1024. It was at Somnath, in the Guzerat, that he refused to be bribed to spare the great idol fifteen feet high (probably a pious laudatory fiction of Firishta) but smote it with his iron mace and found its huge body filled with pearls, rubies, gold, and diamonds. Incredible amounts of booty flowed for centuries back to the Tartar tribes. Then came the great Tamerlane in 1398 for more incredible slaughters. He is said to have massacred on one occasion one hundred thousand prisoners. It is during the rule of his descendants that we look for the climax of human history. Omitting even the names of emperors many and great, we come to Baber, A. D. 1526, descended on his father's side from the great Tamerlane and on his mother's from Genghis Khan, two of the greatest Tartar conquerors that ever lived. The spirit of the man is seen in this: On one occasion in extreme peril of utter defeat he writes in his memoirs that he repented of his sins and implored pardon of God; solemnly resolved to drink no more wine, which he acknowledges that he had sometimes used to excess, he caused his drinking vessels of gold and silver to be melted up and distributed to the poor; he vowed to remit the stamp tax on all Mohammedans if it should please God to give him the victory over his enemies. He then assembled his officers, made a frank and fiery address, which closed as follows: "The voice of glory is loud in my ear and forbids me to disgrace my name by giving up what my arms have with so great difficulty acquired. But as death is at last unavoidable, let us rather meet him with honor, face to face, than shrink back to gain a few years of a miserable and ignominious existence. For what can we inherit but fame beyond the limits of the grave?" The whole assembly, inspired as by one soul, cried out, "War!

War!" (Firishta, vol. ii, page 119.) That he was not conquering a weak, effeminate people is evident from a single incident that might be duplicated many times. When the garrison of the besieged Chanderi saw that they could defend themselves no longer, "they, according to their dreadful customs, murdered their wives and children in the following manner: They placed a sword in the hands of one of their chiefs, and he slew the unhappy victims, who bent of their own accord before him, even contending among themselves for the honor of being first slain. The soldiers then issued forth with swords and shields and sought death, which they all obtained. Not one was found alive in the fort when it was taken." Firishta says that Baber was "a master in the arts of poetry, writing, and music." He was constantly employed in making plans for aqueducts, reservoirs, canals, caravansaries; for introducing foreign fruits and other edibles, for the improvement of the country. His Memoirs, written by himself, are exceeded by few works ancient or modern. In his old age his son Húmayún, his designed successor, was very sick. According to the custom of his country, he believed that he could offer himself as a substitute and save his son. After long devotion he believed his substitution was accepted, and exclaimed, "I have borne it away, I have borne it away." The son recovered, the father soon after died. He was succeeded by Húmayún, 1531; by Akbar the Great, 1556, who was doubtless the most powerful monarch on earth at the time; by Jéhángir, 1605; by Shah Jéhán, 1627; and by Aurung-Zeb, 1657. This is the period that we call the climax of human history. What were its achievements?

One of the objects of human endeavor has been the accumulation of wealth. The wealth of Ormus and of Ind is famed throughout the world. Where the gorgeous East pours on her kings barbaric pearls and gold is equally the theme of poetry. Cafoor plundered a capital in the Deccan in 1306, and brought away a recorded weight of gold worth five hundred million dollars. Even the common soldiers had so much gold they had to leave the mere silver behind them. The amount of booty brought to Delhi under Allah ud Dín gave the city the appearance of great wealth and prosperity. "Palaces, mosques, universities, baths, forts, and all

manner of public and private buildings seemed to rise by power of enchantment, neither did there in any age appear a greater concourse of learned men from all parts of the world; forty-five men skilled in the sciences were professors in the university. There were distinguished professors and teachers of poetry, philosophy, medicine, divinity, astrology, music, morality, languages, and in all the fine arts then known in the world." (Firishta.) Everyone has heard of the begemmed peacock throne at Delhi, the plunderer of which, Nadir, carried away jewels, gold, the peacock throne, and the famous diamond Koh-i-nur, variously valued. Perhaps a fair average would be about two hundred and fifty million dollars. The greatest displays of Akbar's grandeur were at the festival of the vernal equinox and on his birthday. At least two acres were spread with silk and gold carpets and hangings as rich as velvet embroidered with gold, pearls, and precious stones could make them. The emperor was weighed in golden scales against gold, silver, perfumes, and other rich substances in succession, which were then distributed among the spectators. Shah Jéhân thus celebrated one festival, the expense of which was, according to Khafi Khan, seven million five hundred thousand dollars. I have seen two silver cannon and two gold cannon weighing two hundred and eighty pounds each; and a small rug eight feet by six made of pearls, diamonds, and other precious stones, of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars in value. All did not, however, choose to live in such wasteful extravagance. Nasr-ed-Dîn defrayed his personal expenses by making copies of the Koran and selling them. He had but one wife, and she cooked all his food. When she asked for an assistant he refused, saying he was "only a trustee for the state," and that he was determined not to burden it with needless expenses. But what did these people build? Every period of India's history has been distinguished by the building of magnificent temples, palaces, forts, columns of victory, and mausoleums. Sir Thomas Roe, an English ambassador, came to India in September, 1615. He passed Chittoor on his way to Ajmir, and said: "Above one hundred temples, many lofty towers, and houses innumerable were seen crowning the lofty rock on which it stands, but it was at this time entirely deserted,"

The principal glory of some dynasties was the number of temples they destroyed. Mohammedanism was essentially iconoclastic. They ruined temples for the glory of God. No general description of buildings can be attempted. Two instances of building shall suffice. The Diwan-i-khás, or Hall of Private Audience, at Delhi has not, and never had, a rival for magnificent splendor and minute adornment. The Taj Mahal at Agra is the world's wonder. Bishop Heber says, "The Moguls designed like Titans and finished like jewelers." It took twenty thousand men seventeen years to build this poem in marble, and the cost, if all the materials and labor were paid for, is estimated at from fifteen to thirty millions of dollars. It was so built that now, after two hundred and seventy years, one finds nowhere a corner chipped, a crack in the elaborate lacework of pierced marble screens, nor a bit of uneven floor. It is fit to be immortal. It is not only architecture but poetry, and the result of most delicate and tender emotion, being built to the memory of an immortal love. Mumtaza Mahal, "the Pride of the Palace," to whose precious memory it was built, had borne Shah Jéhán seven sons and died in childbed with the eighth while with him on a campaign in the Deccan. All the city constantly flows out to the park in which it stands to gaze for the hundredth time on its entrancing beauty. The birds hover over it for hours, certainly not looking for food but attracted by its splendor. One wants to believe in the transmigration of souls, and that the one who built this marvel and the one to whom it was built can come back and poise on airy wing over the one building in the world most fit to be immortal. I watched two birds a long time in pleasant fancy that this dream might be true.

The position of woman is a measure of a civilization. While the position of woman in India has never been what it should have been, any more than it was in Egypt, Greece, or Rome, yet as there have been Cleopatras, Aspasia's, and Cornelias in them all, so there have been numerous Rezias and Jéhángirs in India. Sultana Rezia was among the most famous of India rulers. "The princess was adorned with every qualification required in the ablest kings, and the strictest scrutineers could find in her no fault but that she was a woman." (Firishta.) Jéhángir married Núr Mahál.

"He took no step without consulting her, and on every affair in which she took an interest her will was law." She was a veritable Joan of Arc in battle, a Josephine in refinement, an Elizabeth in council. The burning of widows on the funeral pile of their husbands resulted, at first at least, from the unappeasable grief and devotion of the wife. And just before it was finally prohibited in 1829 by English law, when commissioners had been appointed to see that it never took place except by the voluntary act of the widow, there was no lack of victims. The fact that the finest monument ever erected to one greatly beloved was erected to a woman is significant of the place she held in one mind at least. The whole force of the Vedic writings was for the exaltation of woman. The maiden of the Vedic times would be an exquisite charm to-day or any day. They could make their own choice of husbands. There was no child marriage nor enforced widowhood. Human history presents no higher devotion than that of Damayanti for King Nala, and Rukmini for Krishna. Edwin Arnold's exquisite idyls of love had foundation in fact. He himself writes: "The native Indian chronicles are full of the mention of famous, beautiful, accomplished, and influential women. It would be easy to enumerate five or six score of such, from the lovely queen of Shah Jéhân, whose tomb is the Taj Mahal, and Aholinga Bai, the noble Mahratta queen, to native ladies royal or otherwise now living, whose characters for generosity, loyalty, or strength of nature maintain the ancient traditions." The old Mahabharata says: "A wife is half the man, his truest friend. A loving wife is a perpetual spring of virtue, pleasure, wealth; a faithful wife is his best aid in seeking heavenly bliss."

Such wealth could not be gathered and accumulated again and again after being plundered, nor such structures reared, without some regard to the welfare of the common people. Allah-ud-Dîn published an edict against the use of wine and strong liquors under pain of death. That was a prohibitory law that prohibited. He emptied his own wine into the streets; the people followed his example to such an extent that for days the common sewers of Delhi flowed with wine. The whole force of the vigorous Mohammedism of the period was against any use of spiritous liquors.

Mohammed Tughlak spent the revenues on public works. He made fifty canals to promote agriculture by irrigation, forty mosques, thirty colleges, one hundred caravansaries, thirty reservoirs for irrigation, one hundred hospitals, one hundred public baths, and one hundred and fifty bridges. For the permanent support of these he assigned endowments of land. This was five centuries ago. Shere Shah, who held the throne of Delhi for five years in Húmayun's exile, made a highroad extending for a four-months' journey from Bengal to the Indus, with caravansaries at every stage, with provisions for the poor at every one, and with wells every mile and a half. The road was planted with rows of trees for shade. Akbar systemized the revenue of the empire, abolishing a great variety of taxes and collecting taxes from the product of the land in proportion to its productiveness. These elaborate state papers have been translated into English by Mr. W. Gladwin under the title of *Ayeei Aknari*, and constitute a system worthy of the most enlightened sovereigns of to-day. Works on diseases and their cure show that much attention was given to medicine. Some of these works were translated into Arabic, and the indebtedness of that people is freely acknowledged by the Arabians. Vaccination for smallpox was practiced in India long before it was known in Europe. Venesection, lithotomy, and couching for cataract were understood and practiced. Doubtless charms and gross superstitions abounded, but knowledge was sought and to some extent attained. Astronomy received such attention that eclipses were accurately predicted and are to this day by tables then made, but which are not now understood by those making the predictions. The ruins of three observatories are gigantic, and clearly indicate that right ascension, time of rising of the stars, etc., were clearly noted. Akbar used to assemble learned men from all countries every Friday to discuss philosophy and religion. Three times he sent to Goa requesting Christian missionaries to come to these discussions, to which Brahmans, Mohammedans, Jews, Christians, philosophers, and disciples of Zoroaster were invited. He usually closed these Chautauqua assemblies himself, reviewing the arguments of all. This liberality gave some offense to the more bigoted Mohammedans. I followed

Bishop Heber's example and went with real reverence to what Heber calls his "magnificent" tomb. It stands in a park of forty acres. It is four stories high. The block of marble above the body is most delicately carved. On one end are the words, "God is great;" on the other, "Let his glory shine." Close by stands a marble pillar that once held the Koh-i-nur diamond as a subsidiary ornament of the place. In regard to philosophy India went to the extreme limits of thought in all directions. I think it was Gladstone who said metaphysics had exhausted its possibilities in India two thousand years ago. Philosophy asks, "Whence came evil?" Against this cold, rocky shore human thought has dashed itself for ages. It has been flung back without breaking the rock or softening its terrible realities. It first said, "No God." No Creator at first and no Providence afterward, or there would be no evil. But atheism was unthinkable. Universal mankind rejected this preposterous glacial theory. Then India proposed transmigration of souls and evil in every life the result of sin in a previous one. This doctrine was not in the four Vedas. They took a cheerful view of life, while this is utterly pessimistic. All the six systems of philosophy that rose after the Upanishads or commentaries on the Vedas regarded life as a curse. Hence life of all kinds, physical, mental, or that of the desires, was to be reduced to the lowest possible limit. Their efforts in this direction are altogether too efficient. The metaphysics of Kabir in the sixteenth century and of Nanak soon after ran all things back to monism; but whether it was conscious or pantheistic they could not decide. Their discussions whether the me or not me could be distinguished were long and the result never settled. The people are as acute concerning questions of no profit to-day as ever.

What of religion? "An unbiased consideration forces us to conclude that religion, everywhere present, as a weft in a warp running through human history, expresses some eternal fact." (Herbert Spencer.) "The soul of man is naturally Christian." (Tertullian, seventeen hundred years ago.) India has originated at least two great religions. It has furnished religions for hundreds of millions of others and never borrowed one for itself. Islamism was forced on India by the sword, but never adopted.

The voluminous Vedas were written over thirteen hundred years before Christ. The Upanishads contain extracts and commentaries on the theological doctrines of the Vedas. There are fifty-two volumes. There are six works called Durshans, each containing a system of theological philosophy. There are eighteen works called Purans, and eighteen supplementary works called Upo Purans. The amount of matter contained in these works is prodigious beyond belief. The Vedas say repeatedly: "There is in truth but one deity, the supreme spirit, the Lord of the Universe and whose work is the universe." A summary of their teaching concerning God is thus given by one learned in them: "Perfect truth, perfect happiness, without equal, immortal, absolute unity; whom neither speech can describe nor mind comprehend; all-pervading, all-transcending, delighted with his own boundless intelligence, not limited by time nor space; without feet moving swiftly, without hands grasping all worlds, without eyes all-surveying, without ears all-hearing; without any intelligent guide understanding all; without cause the first of all causes; all-ruling, all-powerful, the creator, the preserver, and the transformer of all things; such is the Great One." It is degeneracy from this ideal that gives India three hundred and thirty million gods, mostly abominable beyond expression. It will be remembered that India perfected the Sanskrit language, of which Sir William Jones says, "It is a language of wonderful structure, more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either." Such encomiums have been passed upon it by many men learned in its perfectness. The sacred books of the Hindus are written in Sanskrit. The amount of its literature is enormous. Buddhism was the next form of religion. It had power enough to become the religion of the millions of people, and India had power enough to cast it off. Mohammedism with its primal tenet of monotheism came next. It is a religion that still commands a degree of devotion hardly equaled by any other. I have seen an assembly that was calculated to contain ninety thousand people, almost entirely men, in absorbing devotion and prayers at an ordinary weekly meeting.

Just here has been enacted in our times the most signal

triumph of discipline over disorder, of loyalty over treachery, of right over wrong, and I might say of Christianity over heathenism, the world ever saw. Three thousand Englishmen outside the fortified city of Delhi set themselves against forty thousand men that they themselves had drilled and armed, who were inside the elaborate fortifications, and won. As a result, good order, adequate protection, even-handed justice to all, relief from famine, suppression of virulent diseases, large opportunities for education, and consequently a higher range of employment, the breaking down of the most iniquitous system of caste and the swiftly coming acceptance of the one only divine religion, have come to these hundreds of millions with a speed never known before. A nation has been born in a day. Is it not clear that in India was the climax of human history? We must still accent the human. It has man's most horrible characteristics. All of human weakness, wickedness, and passion run rampant has been scattered over every page. There have been limitless slaughters and cruelties beyond expression. The Black Hole of Calcutta, eighteen feet square, into which the Sirāj-ud-Daulā thrust one hundred and forty-six men on a hot June night, and out of which only twenty-three living persons could be dragged the next morning, and they delirious and scarcely conscious—that is a fair sample of the dreadfully human side. The builder of the famous Taj Mahal slew all his brothers and their sons to be rid of all danger from them as successors to the throne. He in turn had a tenfold composite of Absalom and Ananias for a son, named Aurung-Zeb, who sought to follow his father's example and exceeded it by imprisoning his father for the last seven years of his life. His daughter, Jehanara, preferred to share imprisonment with him to liberty without him. But we are compelled to remember the rest of the world. It was the general era when Charles I of England was beheaded in 1649; when the Inquisition, established by Gregory IX in 1235, was still doing its terrible work in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Peru; and when numberless murders followed the revocation of the edict of Nantes in France. The human tendency of one man to say, "I am holier than thou, stand on a lower level," was frightfully accentuated in the establishment and maintenance of castes. It was slavery

without civil law or physical force. It laid manacles on mind, and held in subjection by chains stronger than iron. In other lands one might be punished for teaching a slave to read, but the slave himself would be unharmed. He is too valuable. But in India it was the slave himself who was punished. He had no value for anyone. "If a sudra gets by heart any part of the Vedas or the Shastras the magistrates shall put him to death. If a sudra shall presume to read any part of the Vedas or Shastras or Purans to a Brahman, or Kshatriya, or a Vaisya, the magistrates shall heat some bitter oil and pour it into the sudra's mouth; and if a sudra listens to the Vedas or the Shastras, then the oil heated as before shall be poured into his ears, anseez shall be melted together and the orifices of his ears shall be stopped therewith." (Halhed's *Gentoo Code*.) "Let the same punishment be visited on him who kills a sudra (lowest caste man), as on him who kills a cat, owl, or lizard." (*Laws of Manu*, page 937.) Janab Khan struck copper coins and ordained that they should pass as silver. But when the taxes were paid into his treasury in this coin he had the same experience as those who issue paper money without gold for its redemption. The Hindus say that the wild lust of Moham-medans, whose very heaven was to be made up of joys the most debauchingly sensual, compelled their women to go veiled, resulting in the zenana system of seclusion in vogue to-day. In a harem of multitudinous wives, seldom visited, it would be human to err. I saw in the grand and gorgeous palace at Delhi a too human provision for them. It consisted of four very small rooms; first a place to leave their elegant palace robes; next a bath for purification of the body; then a mosque for the soul, to fit it for the passage; then an utterly dark cell, the only furniture of which was a crossbeam for suspension. Being cut down from this, the naked body dropped into a well one hundred and twenty-five feet to the level of the river. The euphemistic answer to the inquiry where such a lady of the court might be was, "She has taken a trip down the Jumna River." The men were not sent on that voyage. This, too, is very decidedly human.

The hobbles and clogs on the feet of progress in India have been many. This great empire has always been divided into many

separate, warring kingdoms. The asserted sovereignty of individual states was the ruin of the splendid republic of Greece, and was attempted to be of the more splendid republic of America. The degradation of any one man or class of men is so much subtracted from the sum total of greatness. In India the degradation touched the greatest number and was of the deepest character. In religion men sought out many inventions. As Paul says, they became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened. Professing themselves wise, they became fools. The divine remedy for all in the time of Christ was to give the Roman eagles free flight over three continents and to offer to make every man a free man, a child of God. The victory of the first gave free course for the second to run and be glorified. God duplicates his ways of working because they are the best and perfect ways. The cross of St. George flies from the perpetually radiant Himalayan peaks on flagstaffs, and streams in victory from sea to sea. This gives safety to any men or women missionaries to the Himalaya Mountains to-day and will protect them in Tibet to-morrow. Happy the missionary individual or Church that can go forward when the pillar of cloud and of fire so obviously moves on. There is much land to be possessed.

Henry W. Warren

ART. III.—THE NEW EMPHASIS ON RELIGIOUS
EXPERIENCE.

WHAT are the constituent elements of religious experience? Most Protestant Christians, and especially Methodist Christians, are open to the charge of having unduly emphasized the emotional elements. It is the reaction from that emphasis which makes the old-time revival methods ineffectual in most churches. Men no longer believe that emotional depression plus emotional exhilaration are the normal or necessary states of a soul making the acquaintance of God. Many affirm that glooms and raptures are not only unnecessary but positively unwholesome, and even irrational. But that is the extreme of reaction. Tumultuous emotion, while doubtless unwholesome when mistaken for the deeper verities of the religious life, may prove "the finest of the wheat" when grown in the good soil of holy purpose. The emotional is a permanent element in human nature. It is irrational to say we may look for the transports of human love, the fine flashing joys which come from sweet human intercourse, but must not dream of such results in connection with God. Much of the revelation of the Bible has its essence in the transforming experience of the mighty men of the Bible—by which we do not mean a dry chronicle of events in their lives, nor a catalogue of their opinions nor a record of their actions, but vision, glory, rapture, joyous conviction about God. And when we, as did they, brood upon God's truth and reverently and intently gaze upon his work, and by a visitation of his Spirit the splendor of them breaks in upon us and the soul spreads its wings for eagle flights, the glory is not a bit of hysterics, nor a delusion, but a valid and highly rational spiritual enthusiasm.

Oh, we're sunk enough here, God knows!

But not quite so sunk that moments,

Sure though seldom, are denied us,

When the Spirit's true endowments

Stand out plainly from its false ones.

There are flashes struck from midnights,

There are fire-flames noondays kindle,

and the flames of religious ecstasy may be the "authentic fire" of God.

But the glories of religious feeling have doubtless been over-emphasized. Religious rapture is not open to all. That a soul may cultivate its sensitiveness to things divine is not to be doubted. If it will maintain the conditions of humility, purity, and loyalty which the Gospel lays down any soul may have acquaintance with God, but all have not in the same degree of development the power to see the invisible and to estimate the wealth of the treasury to which faith is the key. To insist, therefore, upon any standard of spiritual vision or spiritual emotion as a condition of fellowship with those who believe would be illiteral and absurd. To "become certain of God," to use a phrase of Harnack's, may stand not as a description of certain moods of the soul as a statement of the result of all the experiences of the soul. And we must not be so unwise as to believe that feeling is the only route into the certainty. Clear vision is a most satisfying religious experience. Intellectual emancipations and satisfactions such as Browning hinted at when he said,

The acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by thy reason solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it;

the "Vision of Sin" which Dante had, and Tennyson, not because they were acquainted with the sins described but because they could *see*; that clear perception of sin's nature and results, conviction of its danger, horror at its tragic work, were not these visions religious experience—made possible by knowledge of God? And when quietly we review our conduct, look our tempers in the face, search our motives, even though the process be unemotional is it not religious experience? Or when in the presence of great truth its inner meanings break upon us and the soul exults in clear vision, "This Vision—is it not He?" When thought is disciplined, checked in its riots, brought under control, made the interpreter and courier of the King, is the ordered thought of the mind captive to Christ no part of experience? Emotion may help to give insight, and we need the hours of insight to give us material to fill the hours of patient, sturdy, indomitable purpose. But

we must not confuse the emotion with the vision, nor fancy that the one equals the other.

Nor must we forget purpose as an exceedingly precious bit of experience.

The things in hours of insight willed
May be in hours of gloom fulfilled.

Those choices by which the soul is irrevocably committed to what it sees in its moment of insight are among the richly vital things. In Professor Coe's analysis of answers received from college students to the query "What is permanent in religious experience?" it is shown that seventy-seven per cent found permanent religious experience in things volitional as against seventy-one per cent finding them in things emotional. From which the lesson is plain that "states of the will as well as of the sensibility are included in religious experience." When one makes a holy choice, adopts a lofty ideal, sacrifices self for others, holds persistently to duty though the decisions involve pain in the making and patience in the keeping, such surrenders of the life to righteousness, even though quite unemotional, are veritable glories of experience. The appeal of Jesus to our hearts is not alone as a patient sufferer but as an heroic leader. His life does not merely melt us to tears; it stirs us like a bugle blast. We think not only of the meek humility with which he endured the scorn of men but of the splendid purpose with which he faced the devil and death. The perfect submission of the garden was no more religious than the indomitable will which won the battle in the wilderness and made his face like flint as he looked from Hermon to Calvary. And his cross shows not only meek submission but heroic resolve. To use Dr. Parkhurst's words, "It is at once the tenderest and the sternest thing in all history. It is pathos, but it is flint. It stands for the weeping obstinacy of our God." And when we choose a course which means impoverishment, pain, unsatisfied hungers, as sometimes we must; or a course which provokes misunderstanding, loss of sympathy, and perhaps defamation, and quietly accept the consequences in obedience to our vision of duty, our resolute tread in the chosen path is surely religious experience. There may or

may not be gladness in our step; there surely is the power of genuine religious life.

And to our vision and purpose we must add our aspirations. When unutterable longing for what we have not yet attained surges within us these profound, unspoken pleas are important throbs of the soul's life.

All instincts immature,
All purposes unsure,
Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped;
All I could never be,
All men ignored in me,
This, I was worth to God.

When our "reach is greater than our grasp" as it must be if we are thoroughly alive, we find cause not for discouragement but for gratitude—bits of valuable experience, touches of God, assurances of heaven.

The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,
The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,
Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;
Enough that he heard it once: we shall hear it by and by.

Does God report himself in our experience? If he transcends all possible human experience, then of course, we can find in our experience, however divine it seems, no proof of his existence and no syllable of interpretation of his life. Religious belief and religious form in such case may be of use in developing man, but of no use in revealing God. But that he is in human history is hardly called in question by present-day thought, and that he touches us can hardly be denied. If he is to be found in natural forces as certainly as in exceptional manifestations then his touch is a constant thing. If science and philosophy are suggesting that cosmic force in the last analysis is "as clear an expression of will as is spiritual love" then we may reason ourselves into the belief that God, in the manifold forces which operate about us, is deliberately ministering to us. But the question we are especially concerned with is not "Does he touch us?" but "Are we conscious of his touch?" Is there a sense of the spiritual

world—an immediate perception of God which makes one impervious to denial and independent of argument? Take Tennyson's exaltation of man:

In moments when he feels he cannot die,
And knows himself no vision to himself,
Nor the High God a vision;

and his comment on his own poem, when he passionately declared to his family, "Depend upon it the spiritual is the real. You may tell me that my hand and foot are only imaginary symbols of my existence, I could believe you; but you never, never can convince me that the *I* is not an eternal reality, and that the spiritual is not the true and real part of me." Take Browning's rapturous certainty of God, or Lowell denying the need of argument or of religious form to sustain faith:

My soul shall not be taken in their snare,
To change her inward surety for their doubt
Muffled from sight in formal robes of proof:
While she can only feel herself through Thee,
I fear not Thy withdrawal.

Are we to say that these clear-sighted souls and the multitudes who, less lofty in stature, may nevertheless claim likeness in experience are deluded in their beliefs? Professor James does not think so. "We and God have business with each other; and in opening ourselves to his influence our deepest destiny is fulfilled." It is quite safe to say that deep spiritual experience is an argument for God. And it is the argument which most needs development and is the most convincing, for it is "invulnerable to the assaults of logic."

Given the experience, to deduce God therefrom is a simple logical process. God is the only adequate cause of spiritual life. To be content with any other explanation is to make the highest, most splendid life of which we are capable untrustworthy, unreal. As Brierley says, "The inward life of a saint points as certainly to an actually existent spiritual world as the coloring of a flower to the existence and potencies of light." No analysis of experience weakens the argument. Our psychologists may point out all the constituent elements of religious vision and passion, may discover the stages of intellectual development which are most favor-

able to religious impressions, may seem to make the whole spiritual history of a man a purely psychical affair which can be explained scientifically by means of nerves and temperament and emotionally exciting events, but they have not weakened the argument for God. To point out the processes of life is quite different from explaining its mystery. When men offer a materialistic basis for spiritual life they invert the pyramid, perpetrate a logical absurdity, make a joke of the holiest facts with which we are acquainted. New knowledge of methods has more than once made us fear for the foundations, but it need not. When science bade us believe that this material universe did not spring into being full grown, but by "continuous progressive change, according to certain laws, by means of resident forces," we feared that God was omitted both from the origin and movement of things. But he was not. As John Fiske says, "We are still perfectly free to maintain the direct action of Deity. We may have learned something new concerning the manner of divine action; we certainly have not substituted any other kind of action for it." "At no imaginable future time can science even attempt to substitute the action of any other power for the direct action of Deity." And the same truth holds in regard to the scientific study of religious life. When psychological science scrutinizes the spiritual phenomena of a soul, sets them in order, determines their laws, describes their accompanying conditions, she is not casting God out of them. She is learning his methods. If our experiences be traced to psychical origins and made the result of organic conditions or nervous conditions, in fact a natural product of temperament under certain exciting causes, even if our psychological experts have made out a case, it still remains open for us to say that God is the cause of the experience. God has not been driven from the material universe because we have outgrown the old mechanical notions of his action and think of him working patiently, persistently, through resident forces. Nor is he driven from human life if we say he has used events and the senses and the vital organs and the nerves to bring visions of his face. By what argument can men decide that he is expelled from his temple because they point out that he has used its furniture? The God whose movements may

be known in "every beat of the mighty rhythmic life of the universe" works upon and in the human soul.

"Ye shall be witnesses unto me" said Christ. But we cannot get adequate material for testimony without contact with him. To form a clear mental picture of the Christ of Galilee and Judea from the record furnished in the gospels will not be enough. It is perfectly clear that the attitude of the New Testament writers toward Jesus Christ is that of souls who have looked upon a transcendent marvel. Nothing recorded of him in the gospels is too great to be associated with the Christ of the epistles. His greatness is beyond portrayal. The estimate of those first lovers of his depended not wholly nor chiefly upon their knowledge of his earthly ministry, but upon the spiritual vision they had of him and the moral transformations he had wrought in them. That assuredly was true of Paul, who had not known his Master in the flesh; and as true, we believe, of John, who had known him with the intimacy of tender love. Their exaltations of their Lord cannot be explained apart from their constant spiritual communion with him. Nor will we get adequate conception of him nor be able to give inspired reports concerning him without vital contact. "Back to Christ" must mean not merely back to the customs and thought of his time, back to the history and traits of his nation, back to the actions and words of his three public years, but back to the transcendent, transforming divine Christ who is back of and is flashed upon us by the entire New Testament.

Experience is needed as a satisfying basis for faith. We need to keep constantly in mind the truth so finely stated by Dr. George A. Gordon: "The believer who is despondent over the signs of the times must remember that the Christian truth of the Holy Spirit is a truth for the intellect no less than for the heart. . . . Truths are anchored off shore; the shallows do not allow them to come in. A new use of the grace of the Spirit, a fresh experience under him, is essential to the incoming of these excluded truths. The flood tide of the Spirit is the only hope of the believer." Just as

Life's bases rest
Beyond the probe of chemic test,

so faith's bases rest beneath the reach of a merely intellectual test. The things of the Spirit are spiritually discerned. The Master manifests himself to his lovers. John P. Coyle said that in determining to love and follow the Christ whom he knew he broke the thralldom of intellectual skepticism. Of course belief must not be determined wholly by experience. The soul that does not travel outside the limits of its own consciousness for materials to build into the body of its creed may have an intense faith but a meager one. "The individual tends to identify his own experience with the whole of the religious life, and to judge others by their agreement or disagreement with his subjective standard." Such a tendency is to be resisted. The truth of God is vastly larger than can be accommodated by a human soul. No soul is large enough to contain the doings of God. We must attend to universal experience. Much of our spiritual wealth is by inheritance, not by achievement. We do not separate ourselves from Christian history. We are helped to know that which is vital in us by reference to the historic consciousness of the saints. We will be kept sane by remembering that the Christ to whom we bow is known to us not only by the effects he produces in us, but by the genuine portrait of him bequeathed by the historians of his earthly ministry. The spiritual standards against which we measure ourselves are historical as well as ideal. Experience does not fix the area of our faith, it is our map of that part of it already surveyed and so becomes our guarantee of the reality of its outlying unexplored portions.

Experience should be the inspiration and goal of service. We would not be justified in saying that experience is to be sought because of its possible usefulness. Such a motive would probably make impossible the experience desired. There must be perfect simplicity in dealings with God. Perfect obedience to his call will forbid any ulterior motive, even though it be as lofty as the wish to serve. But service, though not the purpose of experience, is the result of it. Fervent love is one of the notes by which the genuineness of Christian experience may be known; love which leads the soul away from the contemplation of its own attainments or its own needs and makes it glow in self-forgetting service. This

receives special emphasis in our day. Service rather than cloistered virtue or spiritual rapture is the demand of the hour. "It is not only he that would be great, as Jesus said, but it is every philosophical formula or economic scheme or social institution that would be permanent which must prove itself the servant of all." But there is danger that the forms of love be mistaken for its substance; the service of man be made a religion in itself; charity regarded as the only sanctity; the love of man substituted for the love of God. We have no struggle to decide whether we will stay with the blessed vision or go to the hungry poor. The service is more attractive than the vision and in the intervals of the service we do not return to the vision. Yet service is no substitute for immediate knowledge of God. It is rather the result and, in turn, a fresh cause of such knowledge. To decry philanthropy would be ungracious. The beneficent streams of social service are broader and more fertilizing than ever before; and the Church of the living God must engage in such service and be the inspiration of it. But we must see to it that the service is Christian in its spirit and motive and spiritual in its aim. Service is not to be welcomed as a substitute for experience nor regarded as a supplement to it, but as its consummation.

Experience has its value to theology and a value greater than is often admitted. It is a guide to God and a revealer of his truth. Cautious intellect has denied its value in the realms of truth: its apparent disclosures are not to be trusted, its suggestions are to be received with a good deal of reserve. But that is a denial of a vital Christian principle. "The things of the Spirit are spiritually discerned." "He that loveth me, I will manifest myself to him." There is no guarantee of satisfying knowledge of God apart from the passion which Christ inspires and the vision which the Spirit gives. Said Martineau, "To say, as some strangely do, that religious people cannot judge about religion is like saying that the humane cannot understand suffering, or genius appreciate poetry; that for truth in art you must avoid consulting Raphael, and in music you must keep clear of Beethoven. In contradiction to all such pedantry I venture to maintain that only through love and trust can God be known."

It is a principle which has been too little used in the construction of our theologies. They have often been too merely intellectual, too little devotional. They have been built too exclusively of the materials furnished by a dry-eyed, critical observation of the facts of history and Scripture, and have rejected as flimsy the materials offered by flaming experience. Yet how can any soul really know, much less state, the power of Scripture or the meaning of Providence without having, in its own right, a deep-lodged experience of God's leadership? The theologian who does not find his interpreting principle in the glowing spiritual life which is in his own and in other souls is unbiblical in his method. Back of the biblical portraits of God lie the experiences of men. The Psalms are vital with the longings and satisfactions of passionate souls. Isaiah's vision lay back not only of his ministry, but back of his perception of God's character which determined the methods of his government, and back of his understanding of God's purposes as suggested and demanded by the traits and policies of the nations. Paul's vision and acceptance of Christ may be found underlying those mighty expansions of his lordship in Ephesians and Colossians. This is the principle to which we should always hold as we peer into nature in our search for God. Henry Drummond, who loved and served the sacrificing Son of God, found love as well as selfishness in the long story of life's development, and in chapters which are full of the discerning poetry of science has shown us the self-sacrifice which has marked much of the weary struggle of life up from its lowest forms. He has been criticised as being unreliable in his interpretation and charged with reading Christian truth into the natural order. Well, why not? Has Christian experience no part to play in nature study? Which is truer to God as we know him in Jesus Christ—to make the gospel of his love a supplement to nature or to make it nature's innermost and ultimate truth? Which gives us the best hint as to method in nature study—"The strength for the life of others" in *The Ascent of Man* or the sketch of nature's moods and history given by Romanes in his *Candid Examination of Theism*? Personal interest in the outcome may doubtless tempt a student to suppress some facts and exaggerate others, but it is a temptation

easily resisted by one wedded to the truth. And on the other hand such interest, which always gives zest to search, may also give vision and help discovery. Love to God is no bandage for the eyes of a balanced soul, but a clear and powerful lens.

And experience has its part to play in the accurate reading of history. To

Lift the torch of reason
In the dusky cave of life

is not enough. Reason cannot throw its rays far enough. To read clearly "the increasing purpose which through the ages runs" we must have our eyes blessed with the vision of God. What he does in us is suggestive of what he is doing in the wider fields of general human history. The principle of historical interpretation in Bossuet's *Discourse on Universal History* is vastly truer and more profound than the soil and climate theory of Buckle. And that which should make us sure of Providence, and be the death of any pessimistic tendency in our reading of current events, is experience. God's dealing with the soul illustrates his purpose for the race. The individual acquaintance is the prophecy of the universal friendship with him toward which the world is moving. This vision is given and kept bright by him who saw so clearly the kingdom's destiny. We are not greatly forcing a precious text if we say "He that hath seen me can see the Father." Jesus is the "Light of the world," and we may put into our analysis of that word both the processes of nature and the life of history.

In the formulation of Christian doctrine experience should be given more prominence. We can establish the place and power of prayer from modern Christian life. To our studies of the Atonement we should bring as legitimate materials the pain, the rapture, the freedom, the power which come to the souls who really see the Cross. "The Atonement comes to us in the moral world and deals with us there; it is concerned with conscience and the law of God, with sin and grace, with alienation and peace, with death to sin and life to holiness; it has its being and its efficacy in a world where we can find our footing and be assured that we are dealing with realities." If this be true; if the Atonement is an actually operating force, a verifiable fact so far as character results are

concerned, then the souls who have tested its power, brought to it their sin, and received from it spiritual glory, are available illustrations of its divine purpose in human life. If the revelations of God are not over, why neglect the discoveries of his grace made by souls who know the redeeming power of his Son and confine ourselves to his ancient manifestations? Martineau mourned the fact that we have dropped the "Lives of the saints" from our curricula and reminds us that "the only knowledge that can really make us better is not of things and their laws, but of persons and their thoughts." We need the study of rich human lives not only for personal culture but for the discernment of God's way and for vivid understanding of the power of his redeeming grace. In other branches of science the authorities are those who make original study of facts, not those who are wise with book knowledge. And the wider the field of research the surer is the induction. The same necessity is upon the theologian. He must study not only the vital facts of Scripture days but also those of our own days. He should collate varied human experiences not to illustrate psychical laws but to discover the habits of God. Above all, that his conclusions may be not only true but inspiring, his own consciousness should be throbbing with God's life. Theological judgment may be damaged by theological partisanship, but not by religious fervor. Says Dr. Brown, "One of the serious obstacles to Christian progress is the fact that our technical statements of belief so imperfectly represent living issues." "The theology of the future . . . will have its roots deep in life. It will find evidence of God's presence in the movements of the time, and will take up into its catalogue of sanctities the familiar experiences and duties now too frequently relegated to a lower sphere."

More than all, our inner spiritual experience must make character. In the various histories of Christianity we have the record of heresies and orthodoxies; of councils and decrees; of divisions and strife; of creeds and customs and policies; of persecutions and toleration, of church order and worship and activity. But the truest history would be of that which cannot be written: the lives of Christlike people who reach back in solid phalanx through the centuries, humbly and earnestly, though not with per-

fect accuracy, revealing the beautiful character of their adored Master. Our moments of vision, our perceptions of truth, our thrills of rapture, our days of peace, our brave decisions, our eager yearnings must bring, if they would be certified as genuine, patience, gentleness, kindness, energy, honesty, fidelity to truth and duty. In the introduction to Julian Hawthorne's recent book about his father is recorded a touching incident concerning a cabin in the heart of the Colorado mountains. In traveling the son entered this humble home for rest. In the corner of the room was an old miner who had been paralyzed for years. When this helpless paralytic heard the name of the stranger, and learned that he was the son of the great Hawthorne, new life came to him. The old eyes beamed with delight and burned with eager questioning. Nathaniel Hawthorne had been the old man's literary idol. For fifteen years he had read the books of no other author. In the face of the son the dying man searched for suggestions of the dead author's spirit. And the son records his wish that he had for one hour the face of an archangel that he might sustain that searching scrutiny and worthily bear the responsibility which had been made his by the possession of an honored name. Whatever other value is to be found in the conscious possession of the life of God this must not be lacking: our union with him must make us able to meet the questioning eyes of men and give them hints at least of his own holy, loving life.

What is the mission of our religion? One student in a recent answer finds the distinctive element of Christianity in the absence of any specialty, in the balance of its truths, the harmonious concrete manifestation of the elements of the one religion of which all historic religious faiths are partial statements. Another finds its essence in Jesus himself, who is the revelation of the divine ideal for man and also, through his transforming influence, the most powerful means of realizing that ideal among men. And still another declares that the great distinctive thing in Christianity is the gift of the Holy Spirit to men; in this resides the power of salvation and everything in Christ leads up to and culminates in this divine gift. Perhaps between these last two there is no conflict, the one being the statement of the method and energy of

the revealing, transforming Christ of the other. It would seem, if we attend to the teaching of the New Testament and of Christian history, that these latter conclusions are near the truth. Christ was no mere exhibition of God, nor authoritative teacher of the truth concerning him, nor sage with wise reflections upon the beauty of virtue and the danger of sin. His was a dynamic mission. By all declaration, manifestation, and ministry he toiled to get this uncovered, illustrated, divine life lodged in human souls to cure their sin and make their character. And it is this life, this abundant life, redeeming, transforming, gloriously and eternally satisfying, of which our nerves are scant. And this must be the treasure we keep in view for ourselves and for those to whom we minister. By personal example, by church life and worship, by social service, by theological thought and speech, by beautiful character to make common man's experience of God, until the treasure shall be so valued and the search for it such a fixed habit that in all our varied human activities, industrial and political as well as social and religious, he shall be known and declared.

Halace Mac Mullen

ART. IV.—A MODERN THEORY OF MIND.

PRESIDENT STARR JORDAN, of Leland Stanford University, in an article published two or three years ago in a leading scientific magazine, defines mind as "the collective function of the sensorium or brain of men and animals," "the sum total of all psychic changes, actions, and reactions," psychic changes being understood to "include all operations of the nervous system." "The study of the development of mind in animals and men," he continues, "gives no support to the mediæval idea of the mind as an entity apart from the organ through which it operates. . . . There is no ego except that which arises from the coordination of the nerve cells. All consciousness is colonial consciousness, the product of cooperation. . . . The 'I' in man is the expression of the cworking of the processes and impulses of the brain." This quotation is given somewhat at length because it lucidly states the theory, held by many of our leading scientific men, that our mental states are compounds, and the ego is the sum of the resultants of certain nervous processes. When we investigate the grounds of this theory we find that they pretty much reduce to three, namely, the desire of evolutionists to preserve universally the continuity of their law in its application to every domain of thought, the widely observed dependence of mind upon its physical organism, and the revolt which is felt against dualism, with the desire to find a consistent monistic basis. Let us turn to consider whether these grounds are adequate and can be consistently held.

Advocates of the theory of evolution feel that it is necessary to pass without break from inorganic matter to organic and from organic to its highest manifestation, mind. Consciousness must therefore be transformed energy, or attendant phenomena of matter, and since the basis of matter is atoms, the synthesis that we find in thought must be "the cworking of the processes and impulses of the brain, which is made up of individual cells," as "England is made up of individual men." But the necessities of a theory do not establish its truth; and while it suits the imagination well to think of each atom as having a little endowment of

mind, and the more highly organized structure as being accompanied by corresponding increase of mental development, there are objections to the scheme which have so far proved insurmountable. Not the least of these is to see how an atom can possess such contrary qualities as mind and extension, how these qualities are related to each other, and how they can work alongside of each other in the development of more complex forms. But, waiving this difficulty for the present, we have the task presented to us of seeing how these little bits of consciousness with which atoms are supposed to be endowed can fuse together to produce such a larger and fuller consciousness as we find in the higher organic beings, and especially in man. It is easy to use the word blend, or fuse, but by waving the magical wand of a word over a difficulty we cannot logically solve it. The "I" we have in consciousness is something more than a sum of elements, it is a unity; but the heaping of elements together can never make a true unity. It can give us an aggregate, but an aggregate or sum is a unity only to the mind that thinks it, and never in itself. The realities are always the elements. Even the thought of forces fusing does not help us, for force properly conceived is only a static condition of an atom. It is nothing that can pass out of the atom and exist apart from it, helping make up a new thing. The activities of the molecules of the brain can exist only in the molecules, and the mind in the molecule, if it has it, can exist likewise only in the molecule, and cannot get out of it to come and joint itself to other bits of mind which have also left their molecules to fuse together and make a new product, the consciousness of the particular ego. When we use the word "sum" in the sense Mr. Jordan does when he says the mind is "the sum of all psychic changes" we commit the fallacy of the universal, and give to a concept objective reality as much as when we give to triangle or horse a real existence. Class words have their reality in thought, the only ontological existences being the individuals which compose them; and this is true when applied to the statement that mind is the sum of the bits of consciousness with which the molecules of the brain are supposed to be endowed. We claim, therefore, that there is no way of conceiving how the atoms can so unite the mental elements

claimed for them by the theory before us as to make the unity we find in consciousness when we say, "I feel," "I think."

If we turn to the second consideration which has led to the theory of a "collective" or "colonial mind," we shall find that many facts at first seem to sustain it. Nothing is more apparent than that our mental condition is affected by our physical states. If the activities of the brain are paralyzed by chloroform a cessation of consciousness ensues. If the brain is disordered there is a corresponding disorder in mental action. A stimulant will quicken thought and a narcotic depress it. The illustrations are innumerable and have been observed from the time men began to ponder psychic phenomena. But to conclude, from this dependence of mind on brain, that thought is a product of molecular activity is to make a hasty and unwarranted inference. In the first place, it is to be noted that we have here an argument from observation and experience; but experience also teaches us that mind can affect brain. Says Dr. Strong: "If the facts of sensation indicate an action of the physical on the mental, then those of volition with equal clearness indicate an action of the mental on the physical, and the latter is as much an ascertained fact as the former. . . . The case of volition is the exact converse of sensation, and by as much as the one set of facts proves the dependence of mind on the body the other set proves the dependence of body on mind. If, on the other hand, the facts of volition do not prove that the mental state sets up the neural process, then those of sensation do not prove that the neural process sets up the mental state. To admit the evidence for causation in the one case but reject it in the other is to have two weights and two measures." We have few experiences which come to us more positively than our ability to control our physical activities to a certain extent, and also our mental states. We can both will and do. If a thought comes to us which we think is not profitable we can refuse to consider it and give our attention to other things. We can also set before us ends to achieve, and start a train of physical movements which will accomplish what we have in view. This fact of observation and experience makes the question of dependence at best a drawn battle. Nor does it by any means follow, as Shadworth Hodgson would

try to convince us, that the dependence of mind upon body is equivalent to causality; for it may be otherwise explained. We must remember what Hume has taught us about not seeing causes, and that a concurrence of events does not necessarily prove cause and effect. Things may be in relations of interdependence without one being caused by the other. It may be that the phenomena of mental and cerebral action are to be regarded "as conjugate of an unknown cause which has coupled them together for a time," as Mr. Richmond suggests. This is much easier to think than that consciousness is produced by the molecular activities of the brain, a conception which Professor Tyndall has truly said "eludes all mental presentation." Concomitant relations would give us exactly the same phenomena as if the relations were causal. Theories of interaction, or parallelism, or mediation, each of which has strong advocates, would quite as well account for the observed dependence of mind on brain activity as the theory we have under consideration.

Let us now turn to consider whether a "mind stuff" theory can furnish us with a consistent monistic basis for our thinking. Writers of this school tell us we have thought too poorly of matter and have failed to appreciate the higher qualities with which it is endowed. Matter is not simply the old matter with which physics has made us familiar; but, as one phrases it, is a "double-faced somewhat," or, in the words of Bain, "a double-faced unity;" a substance with two sides—on the one side matter and on the other side mind. In all organic forms there is the psychic element; and as organisms become more complex this appears in higher manifestations until it reaches its climax in man. Thus we are informed that, besides being material, atoms have a mental endowment, and occasionally, when the conditions are ripe, run a side line and do a little business in mentality besides doing their ordinary work. Our first objection to this new conception of matter is that it is incapable of being thought. The imagination can picture it, but no one can form an intelligent conception of it. A double-faced somewhat, on the one side matter and on the other mind, is as unintelligible to clear thinking as a round square or a black white. When we posit such a substance we try to solve a

difficulty by running into the fog banks of mysticism. To explain anything we must first of all have a clear conception of terms, and the appeal must be not to fancy but to definition. An hypothesis like the one before us, suggesting what no one can conceive, can give us no explanation. It is as if when a strange object passes the window a mother should answer her child's inquiry, "What is it?" by saying, "It is a centaur." This answer might arouse the imagination of the child, might stir its curiosity, but it would bring the child no knowledge, for it has never seen a centaur, does not know how it looks, acts, or what it is or can do. The answer simply refers the child to an object beyond its experience and hence is no answer at all. The same is true when in explaining facts of consciousness we are referred to a new kind of substance—a double-faced somewhat, on the one side matter and on the other mind. We have here a philosophical centaur, a construction of the imagination, not a matter which experience has verified. We might as well speak of the length of a thought, or the color of a volition, as of "a mind atom," or matter with a double side. We are playing with words, taking them out of their known meanings and putting into them qualities and meanings at will, stuffing them with hypothetical values. If this is permissible we can prove anything—that the moon is made of green cheese, or the reality of Santa Claus and the boggy man. A second objection is that, in this theory of monism, the relation of the mind side and the matter side of the atom, or in man of the brain series and the thought series, is not satisfactorily defined. There are three possible hypotheses, each of which we shall show is inadequate—namely, thought and feeling are effects of brain action, or they attend brain activity, or they are aspects or phenomena of brain substance. To the hypothesis that thought and feeling are effects of brain activity we have, first, the objection that it is in contradiction to the scientific doctrine of the conservation of energy. It is a law of physics that energy can only pass into terms of itself; that is, into some other form of physical energy. Hence, if thought is produced by the specific grouping of molecules of the brain, it follows that thought must be assimilated to causation in the physical world, which means that thought must be material or the law of

the correlation and conservation of energy is broken. For thought cannot be produced by the brain molecules without the expenditure of energy, and each mental effect must represent a certain loss of nervous force. The energy which has thus been used must disappear from the physical realm, must be lost to the physical series. It cannot be returned since, by hypothesis, thought is an effect and not a cause—that is, it cannot enter the chain of effects and be a cause to what follows it. The series stops with the production of thought; for, if thought can react on the physical series, then the physical series is not independent, and we have as much evidence that the mental can affect the physical as that the physical can affect the mental, which is the very point the materialist's theory is framed to deny. It cannot admit, without committing suicide, that thought, feeling, and volition can count in the course of events as well as physical forces. The energy therefore which goes to produce mental effects is lost and cannot be returned to the physical series; which, as we have said, is to sacrifice the principle of the conservation of energy in the interest of a new and hypothetical theory of matter for which we have no other proof than that we hope it will help us solve a difficult problem. But besides this objection we have another equally serious: the qualities of matter and mind are entirely different, and the passage from one to the other is unthinkable. Between the sentient and the nonsentient, between thought and motion, there is a great gulf fixed and no man has yet been able to bridge it. Matter has form, solidity, position, but thoughts and feelings have none of these. The one order of facts is quantitative and the other is qualitative. Modern science is to-day no nearer making matter and mind commensurable than was Democritus twenty-four hundred years ago. We can explain sound, light, and heat on the physical plane, but not the sensations of sound and light and heat. In the words of Professor Tyndall: "Here, however, the methods pursued in mechanical science come to an end; and if asked to deduce from the physical interaction of the brain molecules the least of the phenomena of sensation, or thought, we must acknowledge our helplessness. Between molecular mechanics and consciousness is interposed a fissure over which the ladder of physical reasoning is

incompetent to carry us." Dr. Maudsley, who has striven with all his power to break down the fence which separates the physical from the mental, has been forced to give up the task and admit that the observation of physical objects and the more careful study of nerves and brain cannot give us the least direct information about "feelings, desires, volitions, and ideas." Even Herbert Spencer in one place frankly admits: "That a unit of feeling has nothing in common with a unit of motion becomes more and more manifest when we bring the two into juxtaposition."

With these difficulties in the way it is plain that we cannot hold that consciousness is an effect of brain activity, and in explaining the relation between the two we must seek some other way out. This way is found by some in claiming that thought is not caused by brain movement, but attends it. "The physical series is self-contained and independent. It suffers no loss and no irruption." The mental series is "the subjective shadow which attends the physical series." "Physical energy is not expended in producing thought, but in producing physical combinations which have a thought face." In the words of Professor Huxley: "Our mental conditions are simply the symbols in consciousness of the changes which take place automatically in the organism." Herbert Spencer says that mental phenomena are the "inner side of molecular motion in the brain;" they are the shadows cast by certain combinations of molecular activities. It does not take much pondering of this explanation to see that, while it is easy to state, it is exceedingly hard to understand. We know what a shadow is, for we have seen it many a time, but a subjective shadow of molecular activities of brain is something of which only a great imagination can get any conception. The same is true of physical combinations having a thought face, or consciousness being a symbol of organic processes. Mr. Spencer might say that the terms are figurative; certainly figures, especially when used in defining theories, should contain some meaning, but we are confident that these figures do not represent any idea which comes to us in thinking of the implications involved in brain molecules and their movements. They are simply magic terms with which Spencer, Huxley, and their class conjure with difficulties. They

give no clear idea of the relation which exists between the thought series and the physical series, but only obscure the problem. They do not explain why one combination of molecular activities is attended by thought and feeling and another is not; why there is any order in the mental series, and thought is not chaotic; why some movements have, as their subjective side, ideas, others feelings, and others volitions; or how, if the two faces of matter, the mind face and the force face, do not affect each other, it comes about that the mind face side is shadowed forth by physical movements of the brain; nor do they show how the unity of the atom can be retained if it is endowed with a thought side and a thing side. There must be something in certain molecular movements which elicits and makes manifest the thought series, and this makes thought an effect of matter, or puts the cause back in some hidden ground of mystery in matter itself, which is equivalent to abandoning the problem; or at best it is giving "a double movement to matter, a physical and a thought movement," which "leaves it doubtful whether matter as moving or matter as thinking is the true reality, or whether there may be something deeper than both," either alternative of which is "fatal to the assumed self-sufficiency of the physical series."

But may we not state the relation of the thought series and the physical series differently, and affirm that thought is an aspect or phenomenon of matter? Professor B. P. Bowne, in a lecture before the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, has replied to this hypothesis as follows:

This suggestion does seem to help us a little until we remember that the phenomenon imply not only something which appears but a subject to which it appears. When, then, the thought side of matter is said to be phenomenal the question at once emerges, What is the subject and where the consciousness for which the phenomena exist? For the materialist there is no such subject. Yet so natural is the thought of self that we never divest ourselves of it even when denying it. When the materialist views the brain as a thinking machine he always tacitly assumes himself as a reading machine which reads off the result. When we are told that nerve motions have thoughts for their inner face, a self is always supplied for whom the thought exists. Materialistic statements tacitly assume back of the organism which conducts the neural process a looker-on who tells of the processes and interprets their meaning. Thus thought is said to be a sign of nervous process; but for whom does the sign exist? The out-

sider could not see the thought, but only the nerve movements. For whom, then, is the thought a sign? For the thinking self, of course. Thus the self which the materialist labors to destroy peers complacently through the very arguments which are framed for its destruction.

Having examined the grounds on which the theory of mind in question rests, we wish to append a few arguments of a more positive nature showing why consistent thinking must reject it.

1. All knowledge we have, both of the outer and the inner world, is through consciousness, and in its analysis we find a subject as much an element of its existence as an object, or, to use Professor James's expression, the "I" is as real as the "me." Hume affirmed the contrary, and said: "For my part, when I enter most intimately into what I call myself I always stumble on some particular perception or theory of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hate, pain or pleasure. I never catch myself at any time without a perception, and can never observe anything but a perception." With this idea President Jordan and all who represent the "sum" idea of mind must agree. But let us look at Hume's statement somewhat carefully and see if he does not affirm what he denies. What does he mean when he says "I," and "catch myself," and "for my part," and "I stumble," and "I call"? When he declares, "I never catch myself without a perception," his words clearly imply that he catches himself *in* a perception; for he tells us plainly he observes the perception, and how can an observation be made unless there be some one to do the observing? If we can affirm we never find ourselves without a perception, we may also say a perception never exists without our finding it. The fact is, self-consciousness is a factor in all consciousness, and the principal thing we have to explain is not a thought or a feeling, but the fact that *I* think and *I* feel. Whoever takes the ego out of consciousness destroys it; for it exists only in the antithesis of subject and object. When we study any facts we study them not as abstracts, but as the self knows them. Thoughts, feelings, and desires are not mere successive effects but experiences; and an experience is only a word we use to express a state of self. An experience is not something which occurs *in vacuo*, but only in the existing self, or, in other words, there is no

experience of anything unless there is some one to experience it. The materialist's theory of mind cannot be accepted, for it denies the ego, the element of self-consciousness, in consciousness, which is a part of all our mental states and experiences. It does not give us a subject to detect the meaning and realize the value of the symbols which constitute the series of mental states.

2. We think it can be clearly shown that the two words the materialist most frequently uses to describe our mental life, namely, "series" and "sum of mental states," both imply the reality of the self. I have previously shown that the term "sum" is a mental word and its only reality is to mind. The same is true of all synonymous words used in like connection, as "collective," "aggregate," "colonial," all meaning the total mass of mental states. There is no such thing as a sum, or collection, or aggregate, except to a mind that gathers the factors in a single conception and classifies them into groups by class words. One may put elements together, but they always remain elements and the wholes are of the mind. Indeed, the word "sum" could never have come into existence if there were not an ego to do the summing. And so when we speak of a series of mental states; for the very idea of a series requires the reality of an abiding subject. A series indicates a quantity of flowing or passing states; but how can the idea of the passing be known except there be a subject that abides and realizes the successive character of its states? If there be a stream of consciousness it is only because there is a factor which does not float away with the stream. Such ideas as change and succession can only come as contrary conceptions to identity; and identity can only be thought by that which abides. Hence when Hume says, "The mind is a kind of theater, where several perceptions successively make their appearance, pose, repass, glide away, and mingle in an infinite variety of posture and situation," we ask, Who sees the show? Each successive perception passes and is over as it passes; how can it know anything of what has gone before or comes after? To perceive the progressive unfolding of the play Hume talks about we contend there must be some spectator who occupies the seats and sees the play go through. We conclude, then, to have a series or succession of states of consciousness there

must be a self who abides and is conscious of the states so as to know that they constitute a flow.

3. We maintain that we arrive at the idea of mind in the same way that we arrive at the idea of matter, and have, therefore, as much reason to believe in the reality of the one as of the other. What we have with which to begin our thinking is experience. We do not have things as thoughts except as states of consciousness. Now, when we analyze a state of consciousness we find some factors which are permanent and others which are transitory. Thus in the perception of a thing we have a complex, consisting of extension, color, form, resistance, and other qualities. Of these qualities extension and resistance are permanent, and found in every perception of a thing, but other qualities, such as shape and color, vary indefinitely. We therefore abstract the permanent qualities from the percept and regard them as essential, and as revealing nature. Hence we say that matter and force are realities, manifesting the basal qualities or essence of things. We thus come to think that there is a physical substance which grounds all forms and qualities, and settle down to believe in the objective reality of the physical and go on to reason learnedly about matter. But this matter, let us note, is but an abstraction from our experience of certain permanent factors in our perceptions. Now, when we come to consider mind we find an analogous process and experience. A state of consciousness is a complex in which there are some factors which are permanent and others which are transient. Thus we have ever present the distinction between subject and object, or, to use James's phrase again, the "I" and the "me." The "I" is permanent. There is no state of consciousness without it, for consciousness is the realizing of something. But the factors of the object, the "me," are various and innumerable. They change with every new state of consciousness. Now, as in the conception of a physical thing we abstract extension and resistance as permanent qualities which reveal the essential nature of physical reality, so we abstract the constant factors in a psychosis and think of the abiding and permanent "I" as the psychic reality. As this abides and the thoughts and feelings come and go, we say the "I" has these thoughts and feelings, just

as we say matter has shape and color. And as we cannot think of color as being alone, as not being the color of a substance, so we cannot think of a thought or a feeling as existing by itself, but only as the thought or feeling of a self whose states they are. To those who say we have no consciousness of a self apart from the complex involved in every state of consciousness, we reply that, even if we admit this, we likewise have no idea of extension and force apart from a complex in which there are a variety of factors. In both cases the reality is obtained by abstracting the abiding and permanent elements in a state of experience. We have therefore exactly the same ground for believing in the reality of the ego as that which grounds thought and feeling as we have to believe in the reality of a matter which grounds extension and force. But as a matter of fact we have more reasons to believe in the reality of the ego than in the reality of matter, for the "I," the knower, is necessarily and immediately experienced, while the "me," the known, is always a thought known and not a thing known, and the reality is by hypothesis—namely, the hypothesis that there is an objective reality corresponding to the percept which we have in consciousness. The thing, therefore, matter, has not so direct evidence in its support as the "I," the psychical reality.

4. Materialism in none of its forms can give an adequate account of the constructive and synthetic powers of the mind. The ancient definition of man was that he is a thinking animal, and Pascal has told us that it is his thinking which constitutes his greatness; but on the theory that the mind is only the sum of our conscious states, these states themselves being but symbols of molecular processes, there can be no thought, no reasoning, no rational life. To think there must be not only a series of states of consciousness, but "a consciousness of states." There must be a subject that recognizes the things which come up in consciousness as the same or as different from those that have been experienced before. There must be a synthetic mind which can compare states of consciousness, distinguish between them, and unite them into wholes. There is no way that a successive series can hold together the factors of experience, can so grasp them in the unity of a single act as to compare them and form judgments, or elaborate them

into reasons and conclusions. Nor could there be any forming of ideals, or acting to accomplish ends. But nothing is more constant and certain in experience than what I may call teleological activities. We are ever engaged in the work of developing plans and forming hypotheses, applying rules and formulas, and carrying out ends to their conclusion. The entire history of our mental processes is, therefore, a contradiction to the "sum" theory of mind.

5. The bearing of the theory on the problem of knowledge deserves extended discussion, but can only receive mention. Since the mental series is only the shadow cast by the physical series, since thoughts, feelings, and volitions are only symbols of brain states, all mental movements are absolutely determined by brain activities and conditions. When a conclusion has been reached we have simply the shadow cast by a certain combination of molecular activities. This being the case, we reduce truth to results, direct or indirect, of nervous action, or in other words we cancel truth; for truth means that we compare ideas with some standard that experience has given us and pronounce judgment. Conclusions are not justified by reasons, but "coerced by psychological antecedents." As Professor B. P. Bowne says in his *Philosophy of Theism*:

Nothing, then, depends on reason, but only on the physical and mental states; and these, for all we know, might become anything whatever with the result of changing the conclusion to anything whatever. But this is the extreme of skepticism. Beliefs sink into effects; and one is as good as another while it lasts. The coming or going of a belief does not depend on its rationality, but only on the relative strength of its corresponding antecedents. But this strength is a fact and not a truth. . . . On the plane of cause and effect truth and error are meaningless distinctions.

Nor is there any way to prove on the theory that our thoughts of things correspond to reality. To say that thought is the inner face of the physical process, and must therefore correctly symbolize it, would be a way out if we could hold the position; but no one would care to say that when we see a house or tree the molecular activities in the brain are in the form of a house or tree. In fact, in no case do we see in the symbol the massing of molecules or the brain movements which are supposed to occasion them. What is re-

ported is things and activities that are going on outside and not inside the cranium. Now, then, if thought is the symbol of certain brain movements, or a phenomenon which attends such movements, do we know that there is in reality anything corresponding to what the senses report to us? To believe this we must hold to a parallelism between the symbols and external things that the theory in no way explains or accounts for; or, as another has expressed it, on purely arbitrary grounds we must "affirm an opaque harmony between matter and thought."

Without going into the practical consequences which would follow the theory under discussion, or bringing forward additional criticisms, it seems plain that we cannot follow the "mind stuff" theorists in affirming, in the words of President Starr Jordan, that the mind "is the sum total of all psychic changes," that "all consciousness is colonial consciousness," and that "the study of mind in animals and men gives no support to the mediæval idea of the mind as an entity apart from the organ through which it operates." It would seem, if thought is but the symbol of molecular movements, that there is but little value in Mr. Stanford having given millions of dollars to found a university and place President Jordan at the head of it; but then we remember that this may have been due to the peculiar working of the molecules of Mr. Stanford's brain, and that Mr. Stanford, the ego, did not really exist and have any part in it. It was not, therefore, a result of rational purpose, but a psychological occurrence, due to a certain state of Mr. Stanford's brain molecules. It is needless to add that some of us who have charge of educational institutions would like to see the molecules in the brains of other rich men chance to make similar combinations.

Samuel Plaut

ART. V.—THE PASSING OF A GENERATION.

FOR a year or two past it has been known that in the city of Brighton, on the southern coast of England, a sight was to be witnessed of pathetic interest to the literary world. There from day to day an aged man, long past his prime but with his faculties intact, would sit musing in his chair, brooding the time away. Seaward his gaze would always wander, the calm blue eyes fixed on the channel waves, as though to typify the steady scrutiny with which for nearly two generations he had sought to penetrate the mysteries of the world about him. A lonely old man he was, with none of kith and kin to cheer him by their sympathy as the shadows lengthened on life's dial, and strength slowly ebbed away, like the tide receding across the sands before his feet. Lonely too he was, and always had been, because of a certain aloofness of circumstance and character which raised a barrier between him and the world in which he lived. For though Herbert Spencer had done much to lead his age, as to control its thinking, he had never gained a warmth of personal affection commensurate with his intellectual renown.

Spencer, moreover, had outlived his chief associates, the mental giants of his time. Darwin, who called him "our philosopher," had died in 1882, after a life of richest mental fruitage. Tyndall had died in 1893. In 1895 Huxley, the most brilliant of the group, perhaps, if not the greatest, had also passed, doubting to the end—yet also hoping, as the pathetic verses show which he had chosen to be inscribed on the stone beneath which his ashes lie. Of the Metaphysical Society, founded in 1869 by Tennyson and others for the discussion of the burning questions of the day, Spencer was not a member, though often subjects suggested by his writings formed the topics for debate. At the first meeting of the society Tennyson's "Higher Pantheism" was read by the secretary, in the author's absence, and Mr. R. H. Hutton gave a paper on Spencer's evolutionary theory of conscience. Now of that brilliant galaxy of thinkers—poets, artists, men of letters, rulers, as well as men of science, philosophers, theologians—but a

scanty few remain. Mr. Balfour, the latest of all to be elected to the society, mingles literature and statecraft still, following the greater Gladstone, who, as Mr. Morley, another member of the society, tells us, once closed a letter on public business with the statement that he must hasten to a discussion with Huxley concerning the immortality of the soul. But James Martineau, who steadfastly maintained the cause of positive truth against the negative giants, has gone to his rest. Frederick Denison Maurice was early taken home. Tennyson is gone. Ruskin is gone. Dean Stanley, at whose home the first meeting was held, and Manning, who with others of his later faith, defended spiritual things from the standpoint of the Church of Rome, and Henry Sidgwick, than whom there has been no sweeter spirit among the thinkers of our age—all passed from mortal ken. With truth was it remarked in the *London Spectator*, when Mr. Spencer followed in December of the closing year, that in him "almost the last of the great figures of the Victorian age had departed." His well-grounded and enduring reputation lasts still, and may be expected to continue while men lay stress upon the thought expressed in our mother-tongue. But the zenith of his renown was passed before he left us, so far as contemporary thought is to be considered and the higher measure of control which his system had exercised over the mind of his own age. Some consciousness of this fact, it is reported, clouded, even embittered, the latter days of him who in so many respects had exemplified the qualities of the sage. One would like to believe otherwise as one thinks of that lonely shrunken figure seated in his chair in the Brighton sunshine, or gazing channelward under the soft gray skies of an English winter, waiting for the end to come. But inflexible as he was in his devotion to that which to him seemed truth, unbending, almost fanatical, in his refusal to compromise concerning naked fact or law as he discerned them, Spencer would have been the last to ask that aught but the fullest truth should be told; and so the critic has to record that, though Mr. Spencer's philosophy remains one of the great monuments of the thinking of our time, his influence, alike in its extent and in its intensity, had considerably diminished before his own departure.

In general the fame of the Spencerian thinking and its successes were always of a remarkable kind. Its acceptance has been much greater in the United States than in Great Britain, the home of its author, while on the continent of Europe it has been for the most part less known and less influential than an English-speaking critic would consider deserved. Everywhere it has gained relatively little favor with philosophers by profession—a singular fate for the foremost philosophical venture of the time. Discussed it, philosophical students have always, from the appearance of its earliest parts, now more than forty years ago, to the final revision of the *First Principles* by their aged framer in April, 1900. It has been discussed by philosophers and debated by them. Parts of it they have even accepted, as in much larger measure it has made its way into the general spirit of the age, but among those whose lifework it is to ponder the ultimate problems of thought you will find but few who can be counted members of the Spencerian school. With men of general education the case is different. Physicians, lawyers, men of letters or of business, with a taste for speculation or inclined thereto by the perplexities of the age—many such have found in Mr. Spencer's work a type of thinking which has satisfied at once their intellectual and—strange as it will seem to most readers of this *Review*—their spiritual need. How fully the Synthetic Philosophy has appealed to men of science the writer finds himself at a loss to decide. Concerning his work in special fields it is almost trite to say that each expert in turn admires it in the department of investigation with which he himself is not best acquainted. But whether its use of scientific material, its claims to exemplify scientific methods, its accentuation of scientific conclusions, notably the theory of evolution, and its self-styled reconciliation of religion and science—whether these features may not have proved attractive to scientific thinkers it is difficult to say. If I were compelled to give an estimate, I should be inclined to conclude that the case with men of scientific leanings has been much the same as with thinkers at large: the suffrages of the deepest minds have not often been gained by Mr. Spencer; men of lesser caliber, especially such as with comparatively imperfect preparation have been impelled to face the problems of our day,

have in greater numbers become disciples of his doctrine. The word "doctrine" in application to the Spencerian thinking is deliberately chosen; "dogma" might even be substituted for the broader term without any violation of accurate statement. In fact, the dogmatic tendency was characteristic of the man as well as of his system. In a recent communication to the *London Times*, reprinted in the *New York Tribune* of January 12, 1904, Mr. G. W. Smalley gives an excellent illustration of the trait. Mr. Spencer, to his lasting credit, was one of that small number of distinguished Englishmen who during our own civil war steadfastly sympathized with the cause of freedom. Unlike Gladstone, even, he had never to express regret, as Gladstone so nobly did, for errors of opinion or of speech which in the dark days of 1860-65 helped to turn the minds of our English kinsmen against the North. But Spencer, though he saw clearly in the matter of the larger issue, labored under the delusion that his view was shared by the mass of his people, and, more, he burned to prove it. His private secretary—one cannot refuse *him* sympathy—was sent to the British Museum to gather data to support the thesis that "England had, at the outset, shown more sympathy for the Northern States than she had ever shown to any other people—had exhibited a unanimity of feeling unparalleled in respect of any political matter, domestic or foreign." The argument in proof was at length prepared, but for the time suppressed, on the advice of Mr. Spencer's American friend and follower, Professor Youmans. Much later Mr. Smalley obtained it and secured its publication in the *Tribune*, of which he was then the foreign correspondent. The result is best described in the philosopher's own words: "There was an accompanying leading article referring in a slighting way to the evidence it contained, and, as I gathered, though some small effect was produced, it was but small. Demonstration fails to change established beliefs."

His own established beliefs at least were proof against variation. In great things as in small he always had his opinions, and to them he stoutly adhered. In the preface to the definitive edition of his *First Principles*, written, as has been said, in April, 1900, nearly four years before his death, and introducing the last important work which he accomplished, there are passages which

give well-nigh formal expression to this element in his intellectual character. "In ten days more forty years will have passed since the first lines of this work were written," he begins. Then, after noting the revisions of 1867 and 1875:

Since then there have been introduced no alterations worth mentioning. Of course the advances of knowledge in many directions during intervening years, have made needful sundry corrections in the illustrative passages. Criticisms, too, have prompted a few modifications of statement. Add to this that further developments of my own thoughts have suggested certain improvements in the exposition. . . . Meanwhile neither the objections made by others nor further considerations of my own, have caused me to recede from the general principles set forth. Contrariwise, while writing the succeeding works on Biology, Psychology, Sociology, and Ethics, the multiplied illustrations of these principles furnished by the facts dealt with, and the guidance afforded by them in seeking interpretations, have tended continually to strengthen the belief that they rightly formulate the facts.

And the man who wrote these words at eighty years of age was a man conspicuous for candor though deficient in some of the gentler qualities which adorn, when they accompany, the unswerving love of truth. And think of the years which Spencer's life had spanned, or more pertinently of the years elapsed and the changes in them wrought since the publication of the prospectus of the system in March, 1860: changes in science, from Darwinism to the germ theory of disease; in philosophy, from the mid-century materialism in Germany to the neo-Idealism of the latest English schools; in theology, from debates about Colenso to assertions, roundly made, that the higher criticism is the bulwark of Christian faith; in politics, from the Italian campaign of Napoleon III to the assaults of the French republic on the Church, and the war between Boer and Briton for supremacy in South Africa; in ethics, from the argument that slavery is divinely sanctioned to the longing of civilized man for brotherhood and universal peace. And yet, after four decades of such development, the creator of a system which professedly is based upon facts—of a system, moreover, which was planned and announced when nearly every one of these movements was still to come—could calmly finish his work, "Neither the objections made by others nor further considerations of my own have caused me to recede from the principles set forth."

In order to the production of such a result other qualities were necessary, and higher, than mere dogmatic bias. Foremost among these should be named a noble tenacity of purpose: forty years of ill-rewarded labor—for Mr. Spencer at first drew largely on his rather scanty means to defray the cost of publishing his system; forty years of steady intellectual effort on the part of a man of feeble constitution, and often irritably suffering—for Spencer, like Darwin, was hampered by his lack of health in the execution of his lifelong task. It is said that we live in a money-seeking age, that the things of the mind are now neglected in the rush of the market and the store. Here at least is an exception to the asserted rule. Mr. Spencer's thinking may be true or false, or both at once in parts—it may shortly perish, or it may contribute elements of value to the ultimate theory of the world. But in his devotion to noble aims, persistently pursued in face of difficulty through a long period of years, he is surely worthy to be ranked with the greatest thinkers of all time. A second quality contributory to the fulfillment of Mr. Spencer's great enterprise was a marvelous breadth of view. Four full years before Darwin published the *Origin of Species* (November, 1859) Spencer had interpreted mental phenomena from the evolution point of view in the first edition of his *Principles of Psychology*. Two years later, but still prior to Darwin's announcement of his discovery to the Linnean Society, he had printed in essay form the views which he embodied in certain of the most important chapters of his own *First Principles*. Within six months after Darwin's masterpiece appeared he distributed the program of his entire system. Thus, just after the mid-century was passed, and with little aid or none from the great biological discovery which marked its culmination, he had thought out in outline an evolutionary theory of things—beginning with the star-dust from which our worlds are formed and ending with the highest manifestations of mind and social life. And this tremendous plan he continued to work at until he reached his goal as the century was passing over into the age which was to come. Such an example of intellectual foresight, of anticipation of work remaining to be done, or organizing genius, it would be hard to parallel in the history of the world.

This said, however, it is needful to consider less pleasing questions; to ask whether in an appreciable degree this marvelous achievement was facilitated by the limitations of its author as well as by his transcendent gifts. Universal knowledge is at this stage of the world's history a more than doubtful thing. Leibnitz knew all that the seventeenth century had to show, or nearly all; for Alexander von Humboldt, three generations ago, something similar might also plausibly be claimed; but has there been any other thinker since the author of the *Kosmos* died of whom the same estimate could accurately be made? Perhaps the issue had better be left in an interrogative form: Was Spencer's systematic activity furthered, or was it hindered, by that impossibility of knowing all things created by the progress of knowledge itself? Would he so tenaciously have carried his theory through to the end, had he been fully aware of the difficulties to be encountered in the special departments of thought, with all of which no finite mind can now possibly be acquainted? Certain other doubtful points are more easily determined. It has been sometimes hinted, or even gravely argued, that Spencer's philosophy is false because in early years he lacked the advantage of a university education. But the criticism is hardly of moment; although it might be an interesting speculation to inquire whether the sweep of his thinking would have been more narrowed or directed, had his early flights been confined within the limits of a university environment. That our scientific philosopher, however, was lacking in imagination and in humor, that his mentality was marked by a certain pedantic rigidity, can scarcely be denied. Now, such tendencies of character cut deeper than the surface view of things. There is fair ground in them for surmising that Spencer's lack of imaginative insight seriously influenced the nature of his intellectual conclusions. This is especially true of his agnostic views. For the present purpose these need be stated only in briefest outline: That knowledge—interpreted, a student of philosophy would want to add, in the crude empirical fashion—that knowledge yields man acquaintance merely with finite facts and laws, yet that in some indefinite, and quite undefinable, way man has a notion of an Infinite Being on which the world depends; that the existence of

this Infinite is the common postulate of science and religion when they are rightly understood, and that it so may be made the basis for their peaceful reconciliation; that the reality of the finite itself, *eo ipso* is the phrase the author uses, implies the reality of the Infinite, but that beyond its bare reality nothing further can be known; that, nevertheless, it may be spoken of as Cause, and Force, as the Unknowable Force, as the Incomprehensible Power, as the Eternal Cause, which forms the ground of the relative world. Such is Mr. Spencer's agnostic doctrine—and such doctrine, as it has been often shown, stands in a position of unstable equilibrium. For to say that the Absolute is unknowable, and to say that an Absolute surely exists, that it is one, that it is a Power, that it stands under and back of the finite forces which constitute the phenomenal world—these, as most men judge, are opposing and contradictory principles; or, to be exact, most men judge so who are not agnostics, who are unwilling to confess that they know absolutely nothing at all.

But an objection may here be suggested, based on the relation of Mr. Spencer to his age. Does not, it may be pertinently asked, this unstable theory fairly represent the position of many earnest thinkers of recent years? Unquestionably the answer must be given in the affirmative; as it must be also said that for many Mr. Spencer's doctrine has helped to save some remnant of religious faith and comfort amid the stress and struggle of our perplexing time. Nay, more; this belief in an Infinite Ground of all things, though in truth it falls far short of complete theism, may furnish a world view of real religious value. At this point the mind of the student of philosophy inevitably turns to the vision of another lonely thinker, who lived and wrought in an earlier century of the modern era. Not a Briton now, but an Iberian Jew, his family driven by persecution from Portugal or Spain to settle in Holland, then the home of toleration. This man works at his trade as a grinder of optical glasses to secure a meager living. When freed from labor he thinks out his system, which so shocks his world that his own people read him out of the synagogue with the major excommunication. But still he pursues his way undaunted, yielding to no temptation. He loves truth so

supremely that he will not accept a university chair, even with a guarantee of freedom, lest in some way he should be diverted from pure devotion to truth's service. And Spinoza too is filled with a sense of the majesty of the oneness of creation, as his thinking and his living together culminate in what he calls the *amor Dei intellectualis*, "the intellectual love of God." But there are two notable differences between the Spinozistic and the Spencerian views. The first is logical and has already been suggested. Spinoza argues pantheism on the basis of positive intelligence, maintaining that reason shows his own system the only possible solution of the world. Spencer argues a sort of pantheism from an impotency of reason, and thinks he can defend it by a negation of thought. The second difference concerns the content and value of the doctrine considered as a religious force. Many historians have discovered in Spinoza a mystical element which, if you will, raises the man above the limitations of his creed. In Spencer's doctrine there is an absence of passion; there is little glow and ardor, little burning flame of devotion to the Supreme. Passion of other kinds, indeed, Spencer sometimes shows. His ethical feeling, for instance, is broad and deep, pervading in a noble way very much that he wrote. But religious sentiment, at least in the form of great currents of exalted feeling, is mostly lacking—just as we have discovered a certain lack of imagination and ideal thinking in his mind at large. And this deprives his religious conclusions, even when they are constructive, of their full worth. Specifically, it explains in part his failure to advance from his doctrine of the Absolute to belief in a living God. Never was this defect more cruelly brought out than in the debate between Spencer and Frederic Harrison, on the nature of religion, in the *Nineteenth Century Review* and the *Popular Science Monthly*. Cruelly, even grotesquely, ran the controversy, so that, while faith might profit by the general ruin of the arguments on either side, it is always with a certain sense of shame that one draws lessons from the conflict. Mr. Spencer mocks Mr. Harrison as he defends the religion of humanity. Mr. Harrison represents Mr. Spencer's followers as making supplication to an unmeaning symbol:

And in the hour of pain, or danger, or death, can anyone think of the Unknowable, or find consolation therein? . . . Schools, academies, temples of the Unknowable, there cannot be. But where two or three are gathered together to worship the Unknowable, there the algebraic formula may suffice to give form to their emotions; they may be heard to profess their unwearying belief in (x^a), even if no weak brother with ritualistic tendencies be heard to cry, "O x^a , love us, help us, make us one with thee!"

But, after all, Mr. Spencer's agnosticism was merely the preamble to his system; an introduction, moreover, as he came himself to recognize, which is relatively unimportant for the remainder of his work. The substantive and enduring significance of the Synthetic Philosophy, the contribution to thought which is most likely to give its author permanent renown, are rather to be found in his evolutionary theory. The Spencerian evolution represents a distinct and characteristic type. It is not the biological evolution of Mr. Darwin, which explains the genesis of species by reference to organic law. Nor is it the evolution of the pure metaphysician, as for instance, Hegel, which interprets the world-process in terms of absolute symbols. It is more inclusive than the first, since it starts, or professes to, from primitive chaos, and ends with the most complex forms of moral life. But it neither delves so deep nor flies so high as the second, for it confines itself, again at least professedly, to that which may be directly and positively known. More positively and technically stated, it is cosmical evolution of a phenomenalist type. The principal defect of this evolutionary theory is its materialistic stamp. The law of evolution* is framed in terms of mechanism only; the world to be explained includes mind, and purposive activity, and the varied forms of man's social and ethical life. It is for this reason, as well as because of its vagueness, that the fundamental formula proves inadequate for the purpose for which it was intended, and progressively retreats into the background as Mr. Spencer proceeds from the simpler to the more complex portions of his task. For inorganic science, though with gaps and breaks

* "The law of the continuous redistribution of matter and motion." Fully stated: "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from a relatively indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a relatively definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel change." — *First Principles*, 6th ed., §§ 92, 145.

of grave extent, he makes shift to make it do. At least he so entangles the untechnical reader that it seems to hold. In his biology it is not so prominent. In psychology it begins to break down definitely, holding directly of the evolving brain alone and but indirectly of the mind. In sociology it becomes still more figurative, while in the *Principles of Ethics* it has often to be looked for, tucked away in preambles or dragged into concluding statements, before or after the real work of the discussion is accomplished.

It is true, of course, that Mr. Spencer rejected any materialistic interpretation of his positions. In reply to the charge of materialism his argument always ran that he was an agnostic, not a dogmatist of either school. Not professing to know what the universe might be in its ultimate analysis, *a fortiori* he could not be held responsible for any given view of the world which men might juggle into his system or extract from it. And undoubtedly his contention has its force. Full and avowed materialism the Spencerian philosophy is not, nor materialism in its crass and cruder forms. There is even distinction drawn at times between mind and brain, or consciousness and motion; and some have even thought to find in certain passages from his later writings a tendency more hospitable to the hypothesis that the world-ground is a Conscious Being. But when all this has been said it remains true that, although it is not out-and-out materialism, the Synthetic Philosophy is at least materialistic. A system which starts from the intention to explain the whole phenomenal universe on the basis of matter and motion, which includes in its fundamental formula naught but mechanical change, for which in strictness there are no distinctions but those of less and greater integration, definiteness, and coherence of movements or positions in space, which conceives the Absolute as Force, and force after the analogy of the activities which the physical sciences reveal—such a system may file an agnostic caveat at its beginning or reassert one at its close. But its whole momentum, its influence, its world-view, are of a materialistic kind. In the enforcement of the general idea and principle of evolution, on the contrary, Mr. Spencer's efforts met with great success. Three men in particular, in the century

just ended, have done most to give to later thinking its evolutionary cast: Hegel, Darwin, Spencer. In the first the German tradition culminated. Arguing from idealistic premises, Hegel so wrought the genetic view of things into the thought of the nineteenth century that it is safe to say that, had neither Darwin nor Spencer been born, the world in this age would have been considered from a developmental standpoint. Twenty-eight years after Hegel's death Darwin's *Origin of Species* burst upon the notice of a startled world. The legitimation of a very ancient hypothesis, transformed by the genius of a master, Darwin's work succeeded because it was a product of the rarest union of the observational and the rational faculties of mind. Spencer is often praised as a great reasoner. But the commendation were better bestowed upon the patient, when need was, silent, observer of nature who carefully worked out his principles until they were so firmly grounded that they were fitted to withstand the folly of adherents and the attacks of bitterest foes. Above, some of the data have been given which show that the idea of universal development was maturing in Spencer's thought, or even inchoately promulgated, before he was at all acquainted with Darwin's views. But there need be no controversy concerning the question of independence or the extent of influence. Each man had his tremendous work to do. As the one established a first principle of biology which in its expansion developed into a masterful theory of the world, the second, joining speculation and the principles of general science, sweeping also the results of psychology and sociology into one comprehensive survey, successfully labored to impress the doctrine upon the later modern mind.

A. C. Armstrong.

ART. VI.—THE LEVEL OF PROPHETISM IN BABYLONIA
AND IN PALESTINE.

THE historical books of ancient Israel have not claimed that the ancestors or the descendants of Abraham and Jacob had continuously, and as an entire people, had the same religion. The ancient Hebrew historians have, on the contrary, candidly admitted that the ancestors of Abraham had at one time served other gods (Josh. xxiv, 2), and they are equally explicit in mentioning the fact that oftentimes larger or smaller companies of people in Israel had either worshiped other gods or had violated the spirituality of God by worshiping images, etc. Such conduct of the Old Testament historians must be emphasized, because it belongs to the many characteristics of the Old Testament historical writings not customarily made prominent in our day, but recently collected by me in the small work, *Glaubwürdigkeitsspuren des Alten Testaments* (published by Edward Runge, Gross-Lichterfelde-Berlin, M. O. 75).

Nor have the historical books of Israel been especially silent concerning the fact that many forms of divination were harbored among the people; for example, the practice of 'ônên (or ghônên) is lamented, which verb may have designated the observance of certain formations of clouds, or this 'ônên, as Hubert Grimme has recently surmised,* may have been a kind of "oshinn magic" (osinn a pretended demon). Again, we find the practice of *nichchash* mentioned, which reminds one of the Assyrio-Babylonian *luchchushu*, "whisper of charms."† We also hear the complaint: "My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their staff declareth unto them" (Hos. iv, 12). Here, then, rhabdomancy is spoken of, which is mentioned by Herodotus (iv, 67) and Tacitus (*Germania*, chap. 10) as a custom of the Scythians and ancient Germans. And Isaiah laments that a portion of his people takes part in the divinations of the East and the West (ii, 5, f.). Thus we might continue to unfold the picture drawn by the historians of Israel

* Hubert Grimme, *Unbewiesene im Babel-Bibel-Streit* (1903), p. 79.

† Muss-Arnoldt, in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages* (1900), p. 221.

of the relation of many among their people to divination. These few strokes will suffice, however, to reveal the character of this painting. All we ask further is that the reader observe closely the inscription flashing on the border of the picture: "There is no divination in Israel" (Num. xxiii, 23); that is, in that part of Israel that was faithful to God. This part of the people of Israel was conscious of possessing the prophesyings of speakers or prophets of the Eternal (= Jahwe). Hence the historic sources of Israel very clearly place prophecy (*nebûa*) over against divination (*kèsem*); indeed they distinguish various grades and tendencies even among the representatives of prophecy. In the first place, they speak of members of associations of prophets, prominent especially in the day of Samuel, of Elijah, and of Elisha; but alongside these mention is chiefly made of those prophets who claimed to speak by authority of the Eternal but who represented the tendencies of kings and parties who had erred from the legitimate religion of Israel. One need only bear in mind the unique scene that transpired before King Ahab when he purposed opening a campaign against the Syrians. A whole host of prophets vouchsafed victory, but there was one man who would not make common cause with these. It was Micah, the son of Jemla, who chose imprisonment rather than to deny his prophetic certainty of the unsuccessful issue of such a campaign (1 Kings xxii, 6, ff.). This prophet Micah in the ninth century was a shining contemporary of Elijah. Their successors were, for example, Isaiah, who mentions prophets five times (iii, 2, ff.), whom the people called "their prophets and prudent," and Jeremiah, who had that remarkable contention with Hananiah at the gate of the temple (xxviii, 1, ff.). But to gain a conception of the height of consciousness attained by Isaiah we must consider the words: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight" (v, 20, ff.). Behold how this man discerned all sophistical perversion of ideas and illusionary fancies, and how he dared to brand them, and then judge whether he can be accused of just these errors!

What, now, was Babylonia's and Assyria's position toward divination and prophecy? The answer to this question must naturally be gained primarily from the most recent and most copious source that has been found concerning the culture of the countries of the Euphrates and the Tigris and their relation to the spiritual conditions of Israel. This chief source at present is the new edition of the work *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (1903), the first 342 pages of which are by Hugo Winckler (Berlin), and pages 343 to 653 by Zimmern (Leipzig).

What a detailed portrayal we have here of the relations of the Babylonians and Assyrians to divination! Here we are informed that "Shamash (the sun) was considered the god of the priests of the oracle, or the diviners, who trace their science back to him and look upon him as their guardian patron" (p. 368). "The rôle of Rammân, as the god of the oracle, is unique, and not yet clearly understood as to its origin" (p. 449). But is this rôle of the "weather-god" Rammân not entirely conceivable, since Assyrio-Babylonian divination takes its signs chiefly from the outlines of the clouds and their resemblance to animals or ships, and from the direction in which the clouds move, as has been shown principally by Carl Bezold in his work *Nineve und Babylon?* (1903.) *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* informs us further that diviners traced their origin to Enmeduranki, a king of Sippar, the favorite of Anu and other gods. For, as it is recorded in cuneiform writings (p. 533, f.), "these gods called him to commune with them. . . . To view oil on water, the mystery of Anu, the tablet of the gods, the omen tablet (?), the cedar staff, they committed unto him." The latter was likely a cylindrical implement of cedar by means of which the questions addressed to the oracle were spoken into the ear of the sacrificial animal, from the liver of which the answer was divined. Viewing livers is also ascribed to the Babylonian king in Ezek. xxi, 21. Moreover, "the sources from which the divining priest gained his information concerning future things were quite varied." The following are prominent: divination from the course of the stars, from the configurations and coloring of the clouds, from the entrails of sacrificial animals, especially from the livers of

sacrificial sheep, and hydromancy. It was also quite natural that divination from the flight of birds and interpretation of dreams were extensively practiced in Babylonia, and that prophecies were based upon all kinds of other phenomena of nature, especially upon unnatural phenomena such as monstrosities, etc. (p. 605). What an interesting result! In general the relation of the Babylonians and Assyrians to divination was the same as that of the common superstitions of Israel to divination, excepting that, for example, there is no mention made in ancient Hebrew literature of tracing a "guild of diviners" back to a personality of antiquity like King Enmeduranki, mentioned above. The great difference, however, is this: in Babylonia and Assyria divination, with all its means and organs, was not only tolerated but it was an official institution. Likewise in Egypt the horoscopers were a special class of the higher priesthood,* and were known in processions by the palm leaf, the symbol of time, which they carried. Among the Hellenes, who in many respects ranked high, even Plato declared the stars to be gods (*Timaios*, 38 E), and Aristotle bowed his head in the presence of the stars as in the presence of animated beings (*Ueber den Himmel*, ii, 12). But the representatives of the legitimate religion of Israel were above interrogating the stars, to say nothing of worshiping them. Ancient Hebrew Scriptures repeatedly praise the God "that maketh the seven stars and Orion" (Amos v, 8), the cult of the stars is expressly opposed (verse 26), worship of the sun, the moon, and the twelve signs is prohibited (2 Kings xxiii, 5, ff.). The prophet cried: "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things" (Isa. xl, 26), and the poet causes Job to ask: "Did I behold the sun when it shined?" (xxxix, 26, f.). Indeed the same heaven shone above Babylonia and Palestine, but in the former man looked only to heaven in order to search out in its external mutations the decrees of the gods, and in the latter man looked beyond the heavens into "the heaven of heavens" (1 Kings viii, 27), that is, into yonder innermost sphere of the universe, where in the flight of phenomena God is the fixed pole and the innermost fountain of all life (Psa. civ, 29, f.). Hence

* Georg Ebers, *Ägypten und die Bücher Moses*, p. 343.

Babylonia and Nineveh possessed an abundance of striking parallels to divination as it appears and is prohibited in the Old Testament. But did they also have the prophecy the proclamations of which are preserved in the Old Testament?

Who that hears this question does not at once think of Hammurabi, the old king of Babylonia so much spoken of in our day? It is widely known that in regard to the religious hegemony of Old Testament literature Delitzsch, in his second lecture on *Babel und Bibel*, has called attention to this ancient Babylonian king, since he too has claimed to have received his laws from the sun-god. But by the words used to introduce the inscription of his laws Hammurabi simply places himself in the line of rulers. It is natural that the position of a ruler would be looked upon as a gift of divine guidance of history, although in historic events human freedom also constitutes a factor. Hence it easily came to pass that even more important acts of government were traced back to an incitement on the part of a deity, or the manifestations of God may even be thought of as mediated by the viewing of sacrificial animals or other omens, as is possibly the case of the Moabite king Mesa in his inscription (pp. 14, 32). Moreover, in the plastic representation which shows him above his inscription standing before the sun-god, Hammurabi, according to the most probable interpretation, is supposed to be the companion of the sun.* For in the lines written beneath the representation it is said: "Anu [the god of the upper world] and Bel have called by name me, Hammurabi, the high prince, who fears God, in order that I, like Shamash [the sun-god] should rise above the black-headed, and enlighten the land;" and the close of said inscription also makes Hammurabi, no less than Shamash, the originator of laws. For the close begins with the words: "Laws which Hammurabi, the wise king, has established," and we read further: "My words have been well considered, my wisdom is unequalled."† Would such a sentence ever have come to the mind of Moses, if we

* In *Unbewiesenes im Babel-Bibel-Streit* Hubert Grimme has expressed the opinion that Hammurabi is here intended to be represented as a worshipper of the sun-god. But this is less certain.

† Not until after this do we read: "By order of Shamash, the great judge of heaven and earth, justice shall arise in the land." Thereupon we read again: "The law of the land, which I have given."

consider the entire tradition concerning him? The discourses of the later prophets of the Old Testament often contain the exact opposite. Isaiah would have nothing to do with those who were wise in their own sight (v, 21), and who were called "their prudent" by the then ruling party (xxix, 14). And how loudly Jeremiah protested against the thought of his having received his proclamations from his own heart, that is, from the workshop of his own thought (xiv, 14, f.; xxiii, 26, f. etc.)* Where in Assyrio-Babylonian literature are there any parallels to the discourses of the Old Testament prophets and their sublime words concerning the deepest principles and loftiest goals of the world's history? In the Omina collections, which have been found in the library of Assurbanipal (at Rujimdschik), and one of which begins with the words: "If the Bel-star, etc."? Or in the other large collection of Omina, which is devoted chiefly to lunar phenomena, and which contains, for example, the following sentence: "If an eclipse occur between the first and the thirteenth day of Siwan [which answers essentially to our June], growth will be retarded in the land"? See here thy competitors, O book of Isaiah!

Has it really been acknowledged in the most recent treatises on the relative status of Babylonian and biblical culture that the countries of the Euphrates and Tigris offer no parallel to that Old Testament prophecy by which the true religion of Israel is mediated? Indeed not! One speaker formulates the sum total of his opinion in the sentence: "How thoroughly homogeneous everything in Babel and Bible is" (Delitzsch, Second Lecture, p. 16), and another writer even claims to be able to prove the parity of Assyrio-Babylonian prophecy with the true prophecy of the Bible. Must it not be interesting to follow this demonstration? Come, then, let us accompany him step by step. In the new edition of *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* we read (p. 170, f.): "At that time (the time of Jeremiah) Judah was a vassal state to Babylonia. Hence [why "hence"?] the Grand King kept his overseers in Jerusalem, who had access to the king, and together

* Jeremiah also censures the prophets who were wont to cry out: "I have dreamed, I have dreamed." (xxiii, 25.) Delitzsch overlooked this fact when in his second lecture (p. 19) he remarks: "Here [in Babel], as there [in the Bible], the same world of continuous revelation, chiefly in dreams."

with the strong Chaldaean party were commissioned to work for the interests of their lord, and against the incitements of the opposing party." "If in the capital city the leaders of the party were themselves able to represent the interests of the Grand King in the sense stated, there were professional agitators [*nebi'im*, speakers]* for the surrounding country, whom the opposing party naturally had to employ in entirely the same manner." II. Winckler graciously adds: "Of course, among these, too, there were men differing in endowment; men of independence, and with ideas of their own, or mere speaking tubes of their employers. As the called political spokesmen of the people, however, all *nebi'im* play their part, and hence answer in their relations to what in our day we call politicians." But why does the author take pains to construct the differences that are said to have existed among the "professional agitators" in the country towns of Judæa? Either the prophets, like Jeremiah in the country town of Anathoth (about an hour's walk north of Jerusalem), were "overseers" of the Babylonian king, who had to preserve "the interests of their lord," or they were not. Are we to suppose that they were even traitorous overseers of their pretended employers? What does Jeremiah say to this? What was his consciousness, testified to tenfold by him? With whom did he make common cause? With "agitators" of the "Grand King"? Yea, verily, of the Grand King; namely, of the heavenly world-king. For thus he says in the name of his employer: "Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day I have even sent unto you all my servants the prophets" (vii, 25). Hence Jeremiah was conscious of being a member in a succession of men who, from the fundamental deliverance of Israel out of Egypt until his own day, had stood in the service of the Deity; and whoever supposes that Jeremiah and the teachers of Israel related to him would represent the interests of any other lord heaps insult upon them. Was there a parallel in Babylonia or Assyria to these prophets?

In the new edition of *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* mentioned above we do not read in answer to this question: "No," or "not in reality," or "only in the sense in which

* *Nebi'im* is the Hebrew word for prophet.

Hammurabi—perhaps—considered himself to be, yet did not call himself, a speaker of the sun-god.” No, in answer to this question said book contains nothing but the following note to the expression “politician” (p. 171), quoted above: “On such ‘prophets’ in Assyria see Peiser in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* (1899, p. 260).” Now what will the reader find in the work referred to? In these *Mitteilungen*, in the volume of 1898 (not 1899), the Assyriologist Peiser (in Koenigsberg, Editor of *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*) produces the following fragment from the literature of cuneiform writings of the seventh century as a sample of “courtly poetry” (“*hoefische Poesie*”) (p. 257): “I, the servant, the prophet of the king, his* lord, proclaim these prophecies for the king, my† lord. The gods whose names I have enumerated shall receive and hear these prophecies for the king, my lord. But may I, the prophet of the king, my lord, stand before the king, my lord, and pray with all my heart on my side (? *ina a-hi-ia*). If my sides grow weak, may I by the power of my word (?) put my strength to the highest possible tension. Who shall not love a good lord? (For it is written) in the song of the Babylonians: On account of thy gracious mouth, my shepherd, all men look up to thee” (pp. 258, f, 260, f.). On this Peiser remarks: “The prophets, of course, could not labor without remuneration.‡ In case they received no fixed salary, concerning which we know nothing, they, as members of a free calling, were dependent upon the favor and mercy of the ruler or the notables” (p. 260). This, then, is the material on Assyrio-Babylonian prophecy to which H. Winckler has called the attention of his readers in the new edition of *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. In these expressions he thinks he has shown his readers Assyrio-Babylonian parallels to those Israelitish prophets whom he had just characterized (p. 170). But what does the reader of these words from cuneiform writings really find? He hears an Assyrian prophet speak who stands “before the king,”|| and who never tires of calling the king “his lord.”

* *Bi-H-su*, “of his lord,” is what we really read.

† Here the correct reading is *bi-H-ia*, “of my lord.”

‡ By the way, by whom was Socrates paid?

|| That means “in his service” (comp. 1 Kings xvii, 1, etc.).

This Assyrian prophet, referred to by H. Winckler, is said to resemble those prophets of Jahwe with whom we meet in the presence of King Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 6). But those are the prophets whom the ruling party in the days of Isaiah called "its prophets and its prudent" (xxix, 14). They are the prophets of the people, like, for example, Hananiah (Jer. xxviii, 1, ff.). But the men who were the mediators of Old Testament religion separated themselves from these prophets. Micah ben Jemla felt himself so completely separated from the prophets of Ahab's court that he alone disturbed their unison, and chose to be imprisoned rather than to speak according to the mouth of Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 9, ff.). The prophets mentioned in the portion of cuneiform writings quoted above resemble the men of whom Isaiah's contemporary Micah said: "They bite with their teeth," that is, they like to take part in feasts, and "they divine for money" (Mic. iii, 5, 11), that is, they are in the service of material interests. Prophets like those described in the words quoted above from the cuneiform writings, and like some, alas, even in Israel, were considered by Isaiah (iii, 1; xxix, 14; xxx, 1) and Jeremiah (xxiii, 1, ff.; xxviii, 1, ff.) as their complete antipodes; and when the last named prophet especially is branded "the politician Jeremiah," and is accused of conspiring with the Babylonians,* we ask the representative of this accusation to bear in mind the following words. It was none other than the well-known Karl Heinrich Graf who, in his excellent commentary on the book of Jeremiah, remarked: "No reproach heaped upon Jeremiah can have less foundation than that of a lack of national consciousness. . . . All his words and deeds were permeated by the most intimate love for his people. . . . He exposed himself to all kinds of danger and suffering in order to save his people from destruction, toward which he saw it rushing. . . . He was certain that an extended subjection of Judah under the supremacy of Chaldaea was the will of God," etc. (p. xxix, f.). This last thought must be expressed more pointedly thus: In Nebuchadnezzar Jeremiah saw the executor of the judgment that had to be visited upon the godless majority of the people by the Ruler of the world's history. In the

* *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (1903), p. 170.

name of his employer, therefore, he had to warn against opposing—without avail—the then executor of the will of the Judge of the world. Thus do we understand Jeremiah.

If an analogy to the utterances of the Assyrian prophet, to which Winckler has referred, should be sought in ancient Hebrew literature, a somewhat similar statement might be found in the words of the writer of *Psa. xlv*, where we read: "My heart is inditing a good matter: I speak of the things which I have made touching the king: my tongue is the pen of a ready writer" (v. 1). But the words of the Assyrian prophet quoted above have no parallel in the discourses of the prophets with whom Jeremiah identified himself. A double operation is necessary in order to find Assyrio-Babylonian prophecy in the prophets whose writings are contained in the Old Testament. In the first place, the two lines of Jahwe prophets distinguished in ancient Hebrew literature—the false and the true—must be confounded, and, in the second place, the level of the line of men with whom Jeremiah identified himself in the words quoted above (vii, 25) *must be lowered*. But T. K. Cheyne, a recognized representative of "advanced criticism," has said of the latter line of prophets: "This at least we may say without fear of contradiction, that a *succession* of men so absorbed in the 'living God,' and at the same time so intensely practical in their aims—so earnestly bent on promoting the highest national interests—cannot be found in antiquity elsewhere than in Israel."* In fact, the specific position belonging to the true prophets of Jahwe in the history of the religions of mankind can be defended on grounds so sure that it will never be shaken. These grounds of proof are pointed out by me, for example, in a pamphlet, entitled *Alttestamentliche Kritik und Offenbarungsglaube*, which is now in the press. Hence only one point will be elucidated here that is not touched upon there. It is the relation of Assyrio-Babylonian and Israelitish prophecy, as regards their content. On this point we read nothing in the new edition of *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, except the following sentence: "It is the same view,† the same world-system,

* *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. III (1902), col. 3854.

† A few lines back we read "ancient oriental world-view."

which is the foundation of the narrations in Israelitish, as well as Roman and Arabic (Islâmitic) primitive stories, and which in its essentials is found everywhere in the wider sphere of mankind. It appears again in the calculations of a new age, in reckonings bearing on the time of the advent of a Messiah in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic writings, and of an *imâm* in the Islâm, and forms the foundation of the doctrine of the connection of things, which Kabbalistic Astrology had preserved till the founding of modern astronomy" (p. 2, f.). The opinion of several modern scholars, that "the ancient oriental world-view" forms the background of biblical historic writings, has been answered in my little book, *Babylonisierungsversuche betreffs der Patriarchen und Koenige Israels* (second edition). For the rest, however, the sentences of the new edition of *Die Keilinschriften*, etc., quoted above, contain nothing that could be considered a parallel to the content of the prophecies of the Old Testament. Or does F. Hommel, the well-known orientalist, offer a tenable complement?

Partly in the new periodical *Glauben und Wissen* (1903, p. 9, f.), partly in his book *Die altorientalischen Denkmaeler und das Alte Testament* (second edition), this Assyriologist has voiced a peculiar opinion on Adapa. This name appears in a myth, *Adapa and the Southwind*, contained in cuneiform writings found on the tablets of Tell-el-Amarna and published in the library of cuneiform writings, vol. vi, 1, p. 92. There we read: "1Prudence a wise man g . . . 2His command like the command of Anu. 3He completed for him an open ear for revealing the configurations of the land. 4To the same he gave wisdom, eternal life he gave him not. 5At the same time, in the same year, the all-wise son of Iridu,* like one among men Ia† created him. 12May Adapa hear, the seed of man, 13who with his . . . victoriously broke the wing of the Southwind, 14ascended to heaven," etc. Now, is this Adapa supposed to be primitive man? The fact that he appears as a priest in the sanctuary of Ea in Eridu, and goes a-fishing to secure the necessaries for the sanctuary, is an adequately certain contradiction of such a view; for it is naturally presupposed that he was not the only inhabitant of the city of Eridu. The view

*The usual pronunciation of the name is *Eridu*.

† Other Assyriologists read *Ea*.

that Adapa is the first human being is quite certainly refuted by the fact that besides him "bakers of Eridu" are mentioned (line 10, f.). And the expression "seed of man"* does not prove the contrary,† since said expression can also mean "scion of man." Indeed, in his notes to the above text of the Adapa-myth (p. 100, line 12) P. Jensen remarks: "Even according to this line Adapa is not 'primitive man'" (p. 413). And H. Zimmern considers it "natural to identify the name and person of Adapa with the second Babylonian primitive king of Berosos, Alaporos (to whom Alaparos would apply equally well),‡ even though this identification cannot yet be considered certain" (*Die Keilinschriften*, etc., 1903, p. 522). Said scholar of Munich sees "a synonym of Adapa in Mirri-Mullu-dugga, or in Mirri alone, without the addition of Mullu-dugga, which latter suffix means 'good man' (or also 'man of the good,' that is, of the good God)," and he adds: "In the course of time the Babylonians simply identified this god 'Mirri, man of the good,' with their god Marduk (or, Hebraized, Merodach).§ But a priest in the sanctuary of Ea in the city of Eridu, hence a man, is again simply said to have been a god. Besides we read in *Die Keilinschriften*, etc. (1903), p. 446: "A name Bir, Bur, Mir, Mur, of the weather god, presumably suggested in cuneiform writings, especially in Aramaic words, is not well founded, and had better be left out of consideration entirely, especially as an explanation of the element 𐎶 in Aramaic names," and the author of these sentences adds expressly that he had directed this opinion against the assertions of Hommel (*Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, p. 219, ff.). Consequently the further opinion of Hommel is unsafe,|| that Adapa had been the god who was beheaded in order that men might be made from his blood. He says that on the sixth of the seven creation tablets published by L. W. King, of London, in 1902, Marduk is spoken of, "and not the old Bel-Marduk, the world-creator proper of cantos i-v, but Mirri-Gullu-dugga,¶ who, however, is Adapa again,

* *Zêr* or *Zîr amêlâti* in line 12.

† This must be emphasized against Joh. Nikel, *Genesis und Keilschriftforschung* (1903), p. 129.

‡ This is particularly easy in a text of Greek uncial letters.

§ *Monthly Glauben und Wissen* (1903), p. 9.

|| *Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das Alte Test.*, second edition.

¶ Here Hommel no longer reads "Mullu," but "Gullu."

as is shown by the beginning of canto vii, and also by the mention of Ea in canto vi.

According to Hommel the seventh of these tablets reads:

When Marduk heard the word of the gods,
His heart impelled him, and he conceived a plan.
He opened his mouth and spoke to Ea,
What he had planned in his heart, he imparted to him:
My blood will I take, and will (form) bones,
I will produce a man, a man shall . . .
I will create man, that he shall inhabit (the earth),
That the service of the gods be instituted . . .
And I will change the paths of the gods, and will transform
(their ways)
May they all be honored, may they all be (fortified) against evil.

Therefore Hommel thinks he is justified in considering Adapa, or the god Mirri, etc., to be the *demiurge*, or *logos*, who is supposed to have stood between God and the first man. He also sees the same Adapa, or god Mirri, etc., appear in the scene that is wont to be spoken of as the dialogue between Ea and Marduk, and is often met with in adjurations. According to Hommel lines 1-9 of this dialogue read:

The god Mirri-Mullu-dugga looked upon him (sick man)
And approaches his father Ea in his house and says:
"O my father, sickness has befallen man,
I know not wherewith he shall be healed."
Then Ea gave his son Mirri-Mullu-dugga answer:
"O my son, what dost thou not know? What new thing shall I teach?
What I know, thou knowest also,
And what thou knowest, know also I:
Go, my son, and free him (the sick) from his ban,"

and then follow instructions for adjuring disease. The same scholar also calls attention to the following. He has observed that where among the Chaldaeans Mirri-Mullu-dugga appears, which is always written with the characters "dwelling place" and "eye," we meet with Osiris even in the pyramid texts. Hommel further emphasizes that this name, like its Chaldaean double, Mirri, is written with the two characters "dwelling place" (*os*) and "eye" (*iri*). Another parallel between Mirri and Osiris is found by Hommel in the fact that this Egyptian god also had the surname Won-nofer—"good being," or also "being of the good (god)." In harmony with this is the other fact that Osiris is always repre-

sented as a human being, whereas the Egyptian deities were pictured with the heads of animals as their emblems.

But even granted that all these opinions could be verified, they would prove anew only the following: Certain portions of ancient mankind recognized man's likeness to God in the myth that the blood of the "god" Adapa-Marduk had been used in producing man, and the healing, or in general redeeming, tendency of God. But this latter knowledge, manifest in the introduction to Assyrio-Babylonian adjuration of disease quoted above, and in the Egyptian myth of Osiris, plays only in the sphere of the physical. Is all that till now, according to the above survey, could be cited as Assyrio-Babylonian analogy to Old Testament prophetic discourses really prophecy—that is, declaration concerning the future? True, there is such a declaration contained in another cuneiform text which has recently been cited as an analogy to the Old Testament prophecies. In the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. iii (1902), col. 3063, T. K. Cheyne quotes the following passage as "a Babylonian parallel" to "faith in the Messiah:" "Seacoast against seacoast, Elamite against Elamite, Cassite against Cassite, Kuthæan against Kuthæan, country against country, house against house, man against man. Brother is to show no mercy toward brother; they shall kill one another," and he adds: The countries mentioned are those nearest to Babylonia, which are to be a prey to war and anarchy until "after a time the Akkadian will come, overthrow all, and conquer all of them." He thinks the triumph of Hammurabi, the king of Babylonia, is foretold in this part of "poesy or prophecy." But all these are very inadequate elements (*στοιχεῖα*) compared with the rich and sublime structure of prophecy that we behold in the literature of the ancient Hebrews.

But the content of the prophecy of Israel is to be esteemed sublime, because it has its sphere proper in the domain of the religious and moral, inasmuch as it gives promise of the restoration of the natural harmony between God and the human heart as the final goal of God's course in history. This information shines forth for the first time in the profound passage bearing on the final subjection of the power hostile to God (Gen. iii, 15), and thenceforward star after star appears on the dark firmament of antique

religiosity. This sublimity was not lessened by the fact that the divine Spirit striding through history chose a single nation to be the nursery of true religion and morality, for together with the light of knowledge sent this nation its duties were augmented, and how often it groaned beneath the burden of its historic responsibility! Nor could the nobility of Old Testament prophecy suffer through the further fact, that the flames to which its finger pointed were alike the judgment fire for impiety and immorality and the rosy dawn of a more beautiful day for humility and moral purity. And, finally, the sublimity of Old Testament prophecy could not vanish when it was surpassed by the work of Him who proved himself a sovereign even in comparison with the prophets. No; meditation on Old Testament prophecy and New Testament reality only puts into our mouth the words with which I closed *The Exile's Book of Consolation*: "Prophecy is like the rosy dawn which ushers in the day. The prophetic word is 'a light which shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts' (2 Pet. i, 19). Prophecy is as trustworthy as the dawn certainly kisses the hem of the sun's robe. Moreover, were there no dawn there would be no day, and the soft glow of the morning red prepares the eye for the brighter light and cheers the heart that yearns for the day. But the rosy hue of morning is not the blazing day-star itself. Aurora pales when the monarch Sun assumes his radiant sway."

But if from this point we cast a summary view upon the subject discussed we can but say: It will not occur to any sensible person to decry the effort of the Babylonians in behalf of human culture. Nowhere has this been more willingly recognized than in my book *Bibel und Babel*, tenth edition, p. 20-22. But if anyone exclaims: "How thoroughly homogeneous everything in *Babel and Bible* is!" and when there is silence concerning the difference of the level of Assyrio-Babylonian prophecy and that of Israelitish prophecy, then we must feel ourselves constrained to protest in the name of historic reality.

Ed. König,

**ART. VII.—THE VALUE OF THE STUDY OF SCIENCE FOR
MINISTERS.**

THE minister, by virtue of his profession, is expected to be master of all realms of knowledge that throw any light upon man's origin, duty, or destiny. In common with all men he may gratify intellectual curiosity, develop mental power, and enrich his general equipment by excursions into many fields of thought, but his professional duties require of him the mastery of all that helps in the understanding of man or in the apprehension of God. He is not at liberty to say of anything God has made, done, or permitted to be done, "I do not know," till he has used all diligence in the effort to know. Self-respect forbids that he should have so little energy as to live in a house without going into the cellar and garret, as well as into the kitchen and parlor, that he may know what provision infinite love and wisdom have made for the happiness of the race; gratitude and love to the giver, as well as duty to his fellow-occupants, certainly require him to explore and find out what kind of a world the Lord has fitted up for his abode, and what use may be made of its resources to further his purposes. It is of the nature of disloyalty for him to leave the friends of unrighteousness to discover these treasures and turn them against the designs of their Maker. As "stewards of the mysteries of God" it is our first duty to know all that may be known about them, that we may expound them to others and defend them from the attacks of enemies. To live in God's world without being able to lead the inquiring young through its various apartments with intelligent explanations of its structure, apartments, and adaptations is worthy only of an intellectual and moral sluggard. It lies in the very nature of the ministerial office, and is involved in loyalty to God as his ambassador, that the minister should be able to expound the words and works of God and give a fairly comprehensive view of the divine procedure in this world. We might therefore go beyond the question of value, and show that the study of science belongs to the very essence and integrity of ministerial

character and function. It is a one-sided equipment and service that deals only with the written word of God. His works as truly as his word are from him, and they are the best comment on his word. The word has passed through many human hands, through hands of transcribers and translators: but the works of God stand to-day as they left his hand, original and uncorrupted.

The study of science enables the minister to vitalize the material universe as the creature and habitation of God. The intellectual and spiritual power to bring God near, to make all visible things throb with his life, to be able to point to his footprint on stone, leaf, and flower, and to read the records of his doing in the heavens and in the hidden places of the earth till all things seem to constitute one great temple of the Lord Almighty, is very important for the preacher. The deepest philosophy, as well as the finest poetic and moral feeling, stands reverent before the spectacle of nature's ceaseless activities, certain of an invisible worker there that must be God, or one so like to him as to differ only in name. The impiety of the world has crowded God out of the material, out of the business, and out of the social world, and has relegated him to a little corner called the Church; it is the duty of the minister to bring him back into the temple that belongs to him and enthrone him in the midst of his works as "Lord of all." To do this he must himself be thrilled and inspired by such an apprehension of God, in and over all things, as comes from the thorough, reverent study of his works; he must have his mind filled and thrilled with the facts of nature and of the Gospel, and in his own deep conviction and reverent feeling fuse them into one living message of truth to men. Since the study of science by itself tends toward skepticism, it is imperative to unite these two lines of study, that Gospel truth may sanctify science and science broaden and vitalize Gospel truth and the minister become a living example of the possible union of the two in one person. We shall counteract the skeptical tendencies by studying, understanding, and spiritualizing the field, not by anathematizing it. The Master constantly appealed to nature, and wove into incomparable parables the scientific knowledge of the times; he used the visible and the palpable to help the understanding in grasping the in-

visible and the spiritual. He kept close to nature, held it close to God, and made it vocal with the declaration of spiritual truth. For wisdom of method and energy of force he is the model teacher for all who have minds large enough and hearts warm enough to translate into human speech the message of truth that lies locked up in nature. The immanence of God in all his work must be seen and felt by the preacher, as well as believed, if he is to deliver to the world the full message he was sent to give. And the study of science will aid the minister in developing a well-balanced mind. Nothing adds more to the weight and influence of a preacher than the conviction that he has a well-balanced mind, that he has looked on all sides of the subject he is treating and of all related subjects, and that, having mastered the whole field, he is presenting well-considered conclusions. If he become the mere hawker of second-hand phrases on well-worn themes; if he is one-ideal, if he treats of only one segment of truth and is unable to connect it with the whole circle of human knowledge, he is discredited with intelligent listeners and loses influence with all classes. Study on one theme or on one class of subjects tends to produce a lop-sided, one-ideal mind, a thinker that may not be safely followed. Hence come our theological and denominational bigots, our specialists, ranting advocates of a single idea—a pestiferous brood that has done the truth much damage.

It is important to distinguish between studying science and preaching science. The one is a question of intellectual balance, discipline, and furnishing; the other is a question of professional fidelity and stands related to character. An honest man will do that for which he is employed, the thing he engages to do; if it is to preach the Gospel he may use science or politics to illustrate it, but not as a substitute for it. It is half-educated and imperfectly developed minds, minds that do not know the real or relative greatness of themes, that substitute science for the Gospel; a real scholar, a deep thinker, must forever see the superiority of Gospel truths to the facts or theories of science. The thorough mastery of science, if it is not attended with the neglect of Bible study, will only throw additional light on the greatness of the Gospel and make its superiority the more manifest. The study of language, of mathe-

matics, or of history may be helpful in the same direction, but they do not bring us so close to God nor occupy the mind with truths so directly helpful to the minister, nor do they present facts so definite, fundamental, and authoritative as those of science. Not so much by showing that we are masters of one subject as by showing that we are masters of all truth in support of one subject do we gain the confidence of men. We should indeed be "men of one book," but men with ability to bring the stores of all knowledge to the illustration and support of that one book.

The study of science will aid in saving the minister from dullness and dryness, the great vices of the pulpit. The most common complaint about sermons is that they are dry and dull. This is due to the intellectual life of the preacher. The themes are the most varied, interesting, and stirring that may possibly engage the mind, and when they fail to interest it must be due to defective presentation. If the minister falls back on the dignity and importance of his message, or the authority by which he is sent, or the sacredness of his office, he will learn by sad experience that the prophet must win his way by the effective putting of truth and by his power over the minds of men. One of the greatest preachers of the last generation, the late Bishop Janes, used to say, "It is a sin to be dull in the pulpit." The character of his mission, the greatness of his themes, the interests at stake, and the resources at command make dullness in the minister unpardonable. Yet the cause is not always moral or spiritual, for as matter of fact many most godly men are miserably dry and dull as preachers. The sprightliness, liveliness, vigor, and earnestness of a vital intellect are necessary in addition to spiritual fervor; and these qualities will be aided by scientific studies that will break up the monotony of intellectual life that results from dwelling continually on one class of subjects and naturally leads to dullness. The mind needs to be freshened, waked up, and turned about by change of scenery, variety of food, and shock of transition from one subject to another. This is a law of intellectual life that applies to all thinkers and to all professions as well as to the ministry. The man who shuts himself up to law, to medicine, or to science alone becomes a dry and humdrum hack

that no one wishes to hear. To preserve intellectual freshness and vigor is one of the first duties of the minister, and even if it requires prolonged excursions into side studies, extended travel, or laborious discipline it will pay large returns for the effort expended. The glowing fervors of a true piety need the sprightliness, vigor, and versatility of a thoroughly equipped mind to translate them into speech that will adequately express them to the thought of the world. Much of the best life of the world perishes for want of such adequate expression.

Truth acts on the mind very much as water does on the wheel—sets all the machinery of the mind in motion and wakes up its slumbering and latent energies, thus adding to while calling out the powers of the mind. A hard fact of science thrown into the stagnant pool of thought may agitate and disturb its quiet till the very ripples flash brightness and beauty to the beholder, investing old themes with a new charm. So vast and varied is the field of science that it seems impossible to pass from theology to science and from science to theology without developing a robust intellectual life. The primary question is this of intellectual life, for the truth lies everywhere in rich abundance; but will man find it, feel it, and have muscle to hurl it forth with effective force? Henry Ward Beecher used to go down to the docks and watch the great horses and the mighty ships to get the suggestion of power, to rouse and stimulate his mind to action. It may be even better to dive into the depths of the ocean, climb the mountains, travel among the stars, or come into touch with the mighty forces of heat and electricity; or one may find enough in the torrent that is forever surging and murmuring along his own arteries and veins to keep thought and imagination alive. Insects, birds, flowers, and all things about us are embodiments and expressions of truth so wonderful that a little attention to them must preserve the mind from dullness. Give to the mind this trinity of forces—science, revealed truth, and spiritual life—and they will drive dryness and dullness from the pulpit. The study of science by the minister will promote adherence to fact and to its accurate statement. One of the vices of the pulpit is extravagant and inaccurate speech; that is, speech that does not accurately express

the fact. An effort to be impressive, to avoid commonplace and dullness, to arouse attention, and to give just effect to important truths, leads many honest minds into this extravagance, while others attempt to cover up shallowness by high-sounding words and to atone for the lack of honest hard study by volubility and excess of statement. If the themes themselves on which ministers speak do not invite to this extravagance their nature gives special opportunity. They are transcendental, they appeal to the imagination, to the feelings, to the sentiment of reverence and devotion where limits are not clearly defined, and there is manifest difficulty in speaking with exactness and propriety. Exhortation, expostulation, warning, and entreating tempt the mind to reckless, extravagant speech. And there is always a large contingent of hearers who are ready to applaud extravagance for strength, rashness for courage, and volubility for eloquence; and when it is found that such cheap stuff passes for real coin the temptation to use it may be very great, especially if the supply of the genuine has been exhausted. The study of science cultivates exactness of thought and language. Expression here must, by the nature of the subject, be as accurate as the measurements of a building or the die of the mint—if for no other reason, because any inaccuracy becomes at once manifest and can be pointed out. Measurements, weights, forces, and proportions are exact and invariable. If we go into the laboratory for experimentation, sincerity, honesty, and good intentions do not count; exactness is the only way of salvation. Acids will burn you, gases will spit in your face, and explosions will blow your brains out if you are not exact. Ignorance is worthy of damnation, carelessness is a deadly sin, trifling is scourged with whiplashes of flame, and no prayer is heard, nor is mercy shown to the bungler. Or if we enter the wider field of observation and study all progress is along the line of facts clearly proven and accurately stated. I do not now speak of hypothesis, speculation, or theory, but of actual science. Here all search is for fact, and all expression an effort to define it accurately. The material and tangible character of the subjects dealt with makes this a necessity, not only for intelligent progress but also for defense in case of attack. The discipline of such studies is in-

valuable for the minister as a corrective of the tendencies in the sacred office to which I have alluded. Who has not heard from the pulpit assertions about the teachings of other churches, or of prominent writers or educators, that could not be placed by the side of the ninth commandment? Sometimes a grace or duty, good in itself, is presented so out of place and out of proportion that the whole body of truth is distorted, the minds of honest people confused, and evil rather than good is done. Sometimes a lawless sentimentality is allowed to foam, fume, sputter, and pour out a seething mass of extravagance that only hurts and disgusts sensible people. The facts of the Gospel are great, stirring, melting, moving, and saving, if only we know how to state them and are willing to trust them. The task of the minister is to keep his fervor, his passion, and enthusiasm within the limits of Gospel truth and good sense; and as a discipline for acquiring power to do this the study of science is invaluable, for the very inner soul of the true scientific spirit is strict adherence to fact.

The study of science will be of great value to the minister in developing intellectual strength. This does not imply that theological study and sermonic work will not develop intellectual power, but that the mind will acquire greater strength by adding another kind and a wider range of studies. The mind held too long to one subject loses interest and enthusiasm in it, and gives itself over to humdrum and routine. Healthy growth and development are then arrested, and the mind waits the incoming of new material and the opening of new realms of thought to quicken its energies and arouse its enthusiasm. As the body requires variety of food for its health and strength, so does the mind. One article of food alone, though it be the best, will produce dyspepsia or anæmia. Do not many sermons show signs of one or the other of these diseases, and in their very structure and spirit give evidence of having sprung from a too meager intellectual diet? It is a law of intellectual life, for the preacher and all brain workers alike, that there must be variety of studies in order to intellectual health and strength. Heresies, vagaries, and false theories of science and theology result from the neglect of this rule. Mr. Darwin, the great scientist to whose vast learning and invaluable labors the

world is so great a debtor, is himself an illustration of how devotion to one study alone may pervert the action of the mind, and dwarf, if it does not destroy, some of its noblest powers. In 1836-39, in the beginning of his career, he could say: "I took much delight in Wordsworth's and Coleridge's poetry, and can boast that I read the 'Excursion' twice through. In my excursions during the voyage of the *Beagle*, when I could take only a single volume, I always chose Milton." Toward the close of his career he gives a very different account of his mental state, showing a complete metamorphosis as the result of the exclusive study of science. He says: "But now for many years I cannot endure to read a line of poetry; I have tried recently to read Shakespeare and found it so intolerably dull that it nauseated me. I have almost lost my taste for painting and music." This confession indicates a lamentable decay, from neglect and devotion to one line of study, of some of the noblest tastes and powers of the mind. It is of first importance to the preacher to keep up genuine intellectual strength and true humanness of feeling, instinct, taste, and aspiration by a wide range and variety of studies, and thus save himself from falling off into soft sentimentalism, lazy verbosity, one-ideal fanaticism, driveling and whining sanctimoniousness, and a foolish attempt to atone for the absence of real strength by ranting. The strength of the personality, like the strength of the body, depends upon the symmetry, the balance and harmony, of powers. If a man has strong limbs and a weak heart he is a weak man; if he has a splendid frame and a wasting consumption he is little better than a dead man. We plead for strong, round, well-developed, symmetrical minds; and there is no better method of securing this for the minister than by the study of science. And this knowledge will make the minister instructive. By statement of fact as a basis for argument or for illustration the minister may impart a vast amount of information that will stimulate and direct the minds of the young of his congregation and win them to him. His work lies on a higher plane than this, but often the attention, respect, and confidence of the listener is gained by the discovery that the preacher is a man of large intelligence, and thus the way is opened for his message of saving truth. The man who has

learned a new truth from a minister always entertains a special regard for him and is peculiarly accessible to him. There are many young people looking and listening for the newest and best facts, eager to enlarge the area of their knowledge, and ready to follow anyone who proves himself a capable leader. The minister will greatly strengthen his influence with such persons if he occasionally drops a new fact into their hungry minds, thus acquiring a leadership that he can use for his highest aims. To save from sin is not the only mission of the pulpit, but to build up character in righteousness and knowledge and by such building aid the primary work of salvation. It is within the proper scope of the ministerial function, and according to the example of the great divine Teacher, to use the works of God to illustrate and expound his word. Any act of God in creation or in providence may engage the minister's attention and find a place in his message. It is his business to teach the people the mind of God, and this he finds revealed in two volumes—in his word and in his works.

The study of science will help to keep the minister out of ruts. The processes of thinking, like the rolling wheels of a vehicle on soft earth, cut a track for themselves, that grows even deeper as they are repeated along the same line, that holds them to it and renders it difficult to get into a new and independent course. Many ministers have a few well-worn paths of thought and set phrases of expression, and whatever the text or the occasion they are quite sure to fall into these—to the weariness of their hearers. It is the result of sluggishness, and the want of real energy in pushing out into new fields of truth for something with which to instruct and build up the people. It becomes very monotonous and uninteresting to the preacher, as well as to his congregation, to find that he is in a deep rut that holds him to the same round of topics and phrases. What he needs is something to free him from the old bondage and set him upon a new course, or give him wing to fly instead of plod. Nothing can be more helpful to this end than the study of science. It will hopelessly explode the old narrowness, wrench and twist the mind out of its old grooves, whirl it about in the sweep of great forces, and, like the young eagle flung out of its nest, compel it to fly in the trackless heavens, free, and able

to make its way wherever it will. Intellectual narrowness is to be broken up by broader fields of study that widen the horizon of the soul. Every preacher knows how jaded the mind becomes in an unvarying round of theological studies; commentaries, lexicons, and books of divinity become very dry, and his soul hungers for something fresh and invigorating—and so do the audiences. The study of science will also help the preacher in preventing or breaking up an offensive professionalism. He should speak as a man to men; when he assumes a professional manner or cast of thought he loses power. When manliness, freshness, vigor, and spontaneity are crushed out by a superincumbent ecclesiasticism or theological system, "which neither we nor our fathers could bear," ministerial usefulness is greatly impaired. A man who has been crammed, theologized, dehumanized, made artificial, and thrown out of touch with the world, must get back to naturalness before he can accomplish anything worthy of his calling. It is not walking bodies of divinity or systems of theology that the world needs, but renewed, natural, radiant, forceful men, full of the Holy Ghost and of power. This abnormal professionalism will scarcely be possible to a man who walks among the flowers, listens to the singing of birds, comes into sympathy with insects and creeping things, studies life in its multiform manifestations, digs among the rocks, floats in the air, rides upon the sunbeam from star to star, and in roaming through the vast fields of nature keeps himself natural, reverent, and devout. The study of science will enable him to make the hemisphere of theology a complete globe of truth, and that which was partial and unsatisfying by itself will become complete and satisfying. The world wants the Gospel, but it wants it with the accessories and adjuncts that naturally belong to it. No one has a right to take it out of its beautiful setting in the system of nature and present it in the hard, cold, bald way in which it is sometimes given to men. The world needs the Gospel; not some new thing, but the same old bread and butter on which the saints have lived the ages through. But it must be confessed that much depends on how the bread and butter are made and served. Dry, sour bread and rancid butter have been known to have great power in thinning out a congregation.

The old soul hunger in men is as sharp and quick as ever to respond to that which really satisfies. The Gospel is old, as sunlight is old, as roses are old, as love is old—old but ever new. This is the minister's task, the field for his sanctified genius: to make the Gospel new; to put life into it; to adapt it to the new conditions that arise, and to coordinate it with all knowledge and with all phases of the world's ever-changing life.

But there are those to whom this study of science seems attended with many dangers. That there are dangers I freely grant, but that they are such as to justify the neglect of such studies I deny. There is no good that has not its perils. Our first parents could not walk through Eden without encountering danger, and there has never been a garden since that has not had its dangers, nor an earthly paradise that has not had its lying serpent and tempting devil. There is the alleged danger of a tendency to skepticism; but the proper study of science must ever tend to the strengthening of faith. Many of the most devout men see danger in the temptation that will come to ministers to make a show of their learning in the pulpit. It must be granted that Greek roots and Hebrew stems have often been flourished about before gaping congregations in a manner out of all proportion to their real value; but this is not a valid objection to the work done by the great Greek and Hebrew scholars who have interpreted the Scriptures to us. Others fear it will lead to the substitution of science for the Gospel. This can never be in a well-balanced mind that is permeated by the spirit of Christ. The truths of the Gospel are so much greater and more vital than those of science that a really capable mind will be in little danger at this point. The greater danger for the pulpit is that of becoming dull, prosy, dry, or heavy; these are the vices that are eating out its substance and destroying its power. The path of safety and highest efficiency certainly lies in a wise use of all sources of knowledge, so blending them as to give truth its due proportions and proper colorings.

S. M. Vernon

ART. VIII.—EPISCOPAL SUPERVISION FOR MISSIONS.

WHAT is the best form of episcopal supervision for the work of the Church in foreign fields? There has been a great deal of legislation to meet the requirements of this question, and a number of plans are being tried, but they all seem to be of a tentative nature. Nothing is settled. That the state of things is not satisfactory is evinced by the fact that the plans are frequently changed, and by a lack of unanimity among those most concerned as to the efficiency of the methods now in operation. At least four plans are now being employed. A brief outline of these may help some to understand the situation.

The first plan for episcopal supervision of the foreign work of our Church is that of sending out periodically, at least twice in a quadrennium, a general superintendent, to visit and inspect the work, hold the Conferences, and perform any other necessary episcopal functions in some particular mission field, who, upon his return, makes a report of his work and gives his impressions, gathered while in the field, to the Missionary Society and to the Church at large. The second plan is that known as missionary episcopacy—an authorized form of ecclesiastical supervision exercised by bishops set apart for certain mission fields within which alone they have jurisdiction. The third and most recent plan is that of assigning a general superintendent to a certain foreign field, or fields, within which has been fixed an episcopal residence where he is supposed to reside during the quadrennium and supervise the work of his field. The fourth plan is a combination of the first and second, requiring "that once in every quadrennium every Mission over which a missionary bishop has jurisdiction shall be administered conjointly by the general superintendents and the missionary bishop," they being coordinate while in the field, but in case of disagreement the general superintendents having the supremacy. All four of these plans are now in operation in the various mission fields of the Methodist Episcopal Church: the first in South America and Mexico, the second in Southern Asia and Africa, the third in China and

Europe, and the fourth, in connection with the second, in Southern Asia. These miscellaneous and disjointed forms of episcopal supervision in the great mission fields of the Church indicate a weakness in administration and are out of harmony with an otherwise compact and uniform ecclesiastical government. Moreover, no one of the various plans enumerated above is adequate to meet the needs and requirements of the Church either at home or abroad. It may be a guide to more harmonious legislation if some of the virtues and a few of the more glaring defects of each of these heterogeneous plans for ecclesiastical administration be pointed out, and what might prove to be a better method, combining the virtues of each and excluding most of the defects, briefly outlined.

Concerning the first method, that of sending out from time to time general superintendents to inspect and administer the work in specified foreign fields, it may be said that this plan may keep the Mission in closer touch with the home Church and the source of supplies, and may provide the Missionary Society and the General Committee with an official means of communication and administration in foreign parts and tend to conserve harmony and uniformity in ecclesiastical government throughout the connection. Yet such visits must of necessity be intermittent, and the visitor, at best, only a visitor; precluding, in the short time he can give to the field, much familiarity with the peculiar methods essential to success or thorough acquaintance with the needs of the work or with the strange people among whom he briefly sojourns—their language, their customs, their habits, their religion—and enabling him only to do the routine work of the Conferences and attend to the more urgent matters which present themselves at the time. Moreover, in the interim between his visit and the visit of his successor grave emergencies sometimes arise, requiring immediate attention, with no one on the field having authority to meet them. Add to this the fact that but rarely the bishop visits and administers the same work twice—thus giving a changeable and sometimes conflicting administration—and it may be seen how unsatisfactory this plan is, especially to the missionaries on the field.

There is much to be said in favor of missionary episcopacy. It has been tried in Africa since 1858, during which time three good men have exercised its functions, and in Southern Asia since 1888, represented, likewise, by three men of exceptional ability. It has succeeded so far as its limitations will allow. This plan provides a leader who may also be a missionary. It requires continuous residence on the field. It insures continuity of administration. In the opinion of the Central Conference in the large mission field where the plan has been tried for the past fifteen years, "None can dispute the fact that the system which now operates in our wide and expanding field has made many advances possible that would not otherwise have been contemplated, and besides administering nearly all the field in detail has left its impress upon every institution connected with our Church. Best of all, it has made feasible frequent personal counsel and advice for every responsible worker from one intimately acquainted with the genesis and growth of the enterprises each represents." And the senior missionary bishop has affirmed that "The presence of a superintending leader is of the utmost importance. The isolation of the workers, the inexperience of most of the convert preachers, the pioneer character of the work, the necessity of devising new measures, the constant care to make organization keep pace with progress, the liability of dissension—these, and a score of other reasons, might be named as indicating the urgent need of a superintending leader on the field." But missionary episcopacy, as a policy, is but a tentative measure. At best it is only a makeshift. It has inherent weaknesses which may become more fully manifest at any time. A quadrennial episcopal candidature on the mission field does not conduce to harmony. The selection of a missionary bishop is not restricted to a choice from among missionaries of long residence on the field. The one chosen may not be a missionary at all. If taken from the nonmissionary ranks the result might be the opposite of those claimed for the system. The choice from among missionaries is limited; a misfit would be a calamity difficult to recover from. Furthermore, missionary episcopacy is limited episcopacy. A missionary bishop is not a general superintendent, and cannot become one except by

distinct election to that office. He is not a bishop at all out of his own field. He cannot perform any of the special functions of the regular bishops beyond the limits of his diocese. His field must be inspected at least once in every quadrennium by a general superintendent. It may not have been so intended, but this is a degradation of the man and of the Mission. As some one has said, "The missionary episcopacy must struggle hard to ennoble itself. The office humiliates the officer." And hence a great man submitting to it for the work's sake was yet clear-minded enough to see that "the restrictions imposed on missionary bishops are a trifle absurd." It "forbids a man who has authority to ordain in Lucknow and Bombay to perform the same duty after he passes Aden, at the mouth of the Red Sea, even though requested to do so by sixteen bishops." Missionary episcopacy takes the mission field, in a measure, out of touch with the home Church. The field loses some sympathy by having its own special advocate, and yet when he is on his field he is away from the source of supplies, and when he is away from his field he is not a bishop. The absurdity of this disjointed and limited episcopacy renders it objectionable, especially as all its many undoubted advantages would still be retained after a simple and just act of legislation, inaugurating a better plan, had done away with it.

Fixing episcopal residences in foreign fields for general superintendents is an advance upon all previous legislation, for it insures, what is essential to the success of the work, "the continuous personal superintendence of a responsible leader," and gives a definite field of labor to a general superintendent. This is much better than "a series of annual visits from an ever-changing number of bishops." It is even better, in some ways, than missionary episcopacy, for it is not limited. But still it is liable to some serious weaknesses. The person sent may not go from choice. He is simply assigned to the field. He may not have any special interest in missions. He will, usually, be the latest addition to the Board of Bishops. If he has no particular liking for the field to which he has been assigned he may not remain on it continuously. The quadrennial inspection of a Mission under the jurisdiction of a missionary bishop by a general superintendent

has occurred twice, and has been successful as far as the limitations of the plan will allow. It corrects one of the defects of missionary episcopacy by bringing the field into closer touch with the Missionary Society, in whose interests the visitation is made; but it also appears to point out and emphasize the defects and limitations of missionary episcopacy and tends to minify and degrade the office. Moreover, it seems like a useless expense, and, in fact, would never have been thought of had the bishop in the foreign field been a general superintendent. It would be rendered entirely unnecessary if the changes herein advocated were adopted.

We come, therefore, to the conclusion that no plan for the episcopal government of foreign missions has yet been devised which has not in its practical workings shown inherent weaknesses. These weaknesses are all in the policy; for no one can find fault with the administration of the incumbents, whether general superintendents or missionary bishops. There never will be that harmony which is desirable until a plan is devised which will conserve the strength and unity of episcopacy and at the same time meet all the requirements of the work on the field. The kind of episcopacy that is needed is that which provides a leader who thoroughly knows both the foreign mission and the home Church, and who is not only once a bishop but always a bishop, a bishop everywhere and all the time. He should be familiar with the particular field over which he has supervision, and, if possible, know the language, history, literature, religions, customs, habits, feelings, and heart life of the people among whom he lives. He should know the men and women working in his field and their ability and adaptability in and for the work to which he appoints them. At the same time he should be a man of the largest influence at home. He should be able to exercise full episcopal powers in all lands and in all climes. He should feel, and be able to make others feel, that the Church is one, and has but one form of episcopal administration, and that there is no territorial limit to episcopal functions and powers, and that in the Methodist Episcopal Church, from Boston to Borneo and from Bareilly to Berlin, there is but one kind of bishop; and that there is no administrative need to have one bishop sent to inspect another's work

or to have the work spasmodically administered by an unfamiliar official of the Church. There are but three easy steps to the accomplishment of the much-needed plan proposed. Each of the plans now in operation can contribute something toward the success of the desirable plan, which, when in operation, will at once eliminate the main defects of the methods now being tried. The first step is to so group the Conferences and mission fields as to allow a bishop to exercise his episcopal functions in a certain district during a quadrennium, the same bishop being eligible for reappointment. This is practicable, for it has already been done for China and Europe. The next step will be to delete from the Book of Discipline all reference to missionary episcopacy, whether in the Third Restrictive Rule or in Part Third. This can be done in the Disciplinary way provided for in the Constitution of the General Conference. And the last step will be to elect to the general superintendency the three noble men—the peers of any bishops on the Board—now serving as missionary bishops in Africa and Southern Asia, and assign them, as general superintendents, to their present respective fields. To provide for succession in office let well-trying men on the various fields, or men familiar with those fields and who have the missionary spirit, be elected, as required, to the office, and assigned, as they naturally would be, to the fields which they are best fitted to administer. This plan would do away with the present grades in the episcopal office, would bring the Missions into closer touch with the mother Church, and, by having able men, who have power to administer anywhere, preside over them, would give the Missions a more efficient administration, would remove that unrest and friction among the missionaries on the field over the ever-recurring and never-settled question of administration and succession, and, lastly, would tend to bring about that unity and harmony throughout the whole Church so essential to its success.

J. E. Scott,

ART. IX.—THE ENGLISH MAY MEETINGS.

LONDON is not England any more than New York is America, but an observer who wished to gauge the sentiment of the English Churches or to estimate the style of English religious eloquence might gather all the necessary material by spending two or three weeks in the English metropolis—provided they were the right weeks. At one particular time of year there may be found within two or three London halls representatives of all the Churches from all parts of the kingdom, and the speakers who address these assemblies are equally varied in ecclesiastical connection and local habitation. The area covered by the unique institution of the May Meeting is surprisingly large. Originally every May Meeting was held in May, but the program has become so enlarged that four additional months have been pressed into service. Last year the first entry on the official list was the meeting in behalf of the Children's Hospital for Hip Disease, on March 25, and the last the anniversary of the Pentecostal League on July 21. But in spite of this expansion May still retains the most important place, as of the twenty-two pages in the guidebook twelve are devoted to that month. The range of organizations represented is of corresponding extent. All the Protestant Churches—Anglican, Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Moravian, etc.—have their own denominational meetings, mainly in connection with their home and foreign missions. The great undenominational religious societies, such as the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, and the Young Men's Christian Association, appear on the list, as well as Protestant associations, temperance societies, and peace and arbitration societies of various shades. One notable feature is the number of organizations for the promotion of the religious life among members of specific professions and occupations; for example, the Medical Prayer Union, the Lawyers' Prayer Union, the Law Clerks' Christian Association, the Civil Service Prayer Union, the Commercial Travelers' Christian Union, the Soldiers' Christian Association, the Christian Police Association, the Railway Mission,

and the Mission to Coalies and Carmen. Benevolent societies bulk largely, for we find many such items as the Reformatory and Refuge Union, the Children's Fresh Air Mission, the Governesses' Benevolent Institution, and the Cabdrivers' Benevolent Society. The ingenuity of modern evangelism is suggested by the announcement of the Tram and Bus Text Mission, while the advertisements of the Prophecy Investigation Society and the British Ephraim Society provoke reflections upon the waste of misdirected zeal.

Amid all changes, Exeter Hall remains *par excellence* the home of the May Meeting, for eighty-five per cent of the meetings appearing on the complete program are held within its walls. In addition to the large hall, which accommodates five thousand persons, it possesses several smaller assembly rooms, so it is not at all unusual, in the thick of the season, for two or three meetings to be set down simultaneously for this one building. Exeter Hall has the advantage of an accessible situation, being only a few yards from Charing Cross, and—what is worth far more—of a great evangelistic and philanthropic tradition. Quiet and decorous as are most of the people who compose its gatherings, it has been the headquarters of agitations that have turned many things upside down—and big things too. That it has made itself felt is evident from the sneers of its critics no less than from the eulogies of its admirers. Dickens had his fling at it when, in *Nicholas Nickleby*, he made Miss La Creevy, the miniature painter, looking out of her window for ideas of noses, declare that “there are flats of all sorts and sizes when there’s a meeting at Exeter Hall,” and Macaulay’s gibe at “the bray of Exeter Hall” has become proverbial. Macaulay never had the reputation of being a good judge of musical sounds, and it may be that his ear was at fault in this instance; but, if he was correct in his appreciation of the characteristic vocal expression of Exeter Hall feeling, it is at any rate a bray that has been heard round the world, and that has penetrated some distinguished craniums that have been deaf to parliamentary speeches. Mr. Moncure Conway—a man certainly not prejudiced in favor of evangelical religion—scarcely exaggerated when he declared some years ago, in a lecture on the prose and poetry of London, that “the anniversaries of Exeter Hall determine peace

or tribulation for the tribes of Africa, India, China, and other regions." When visiting Hongkong I came across an interesting illustration of the influence of this much-abused center of philanthropic effort. I was talking to a government official, and happened to refer to the licensed gambling houses from which the neighboring Portuguese colony of Macao derives most of its revenue. "Yes," said he; "we used to have the same system here, and we derived a large income from it, but we had to give it up, as Exeter Hall was too strong for us." A much newer and more attractive building is the Queen's Hall, which is used for concerts all the year round and is growing in popularity with the promoters of May Meetings. Its name is a reminder that it was opened in the year of Queen Victoria's jubilee. St. James's Hall, in Piccadilly, well known as the home of the late Mr. Hugh Price Hughes's mission, is also in considerable request, but its usefulness in this respect will soon be at an end, as it is about to be torn down. The Albert Hall, which will hold an audience of ten thousand, is engaged when what is mainly required is a "demonstration" of numbers, but its size makes it unsuitable for anniversaries of the ordinary kind. Speaking is rarely effective there, even with a full house, and an assembly of only two or three thousand scattered about so huge a building is a pitiful spectacle. A few societies are fortunate enough to secure the cooperation of the lord mayor, and consequently enjoy the privilege of using the Mansion House or the Guildhall. It seems, perhaps, incongruous that May Meetings should be held in hotels, but year by year the Cannon Street Hotel, the Hotel Metropole, and the Holborn Restaurant figure on the list. These, however, are rarely utilized for meetings of the usual type, but are generally pressed into service for breakfasts, dinners, and receptions in aid of various charitable societies. But the May Meetings are not limited to "neutral" ground. Churches which rent Exeter Hall for their larger missionary meetings often turn their own buildings to account for other gatherings. Thus, there is often something going on at Lambeth Palace, Sion College, and the Church House (Anglican), City Road Chapel (Wesleyan Methodist), the City Temple and the Memorial Hall (Congregationalist), and the Metropolitan

Tabernacle and Bloomsbury Chapel (Baptist). And as some anniversary celebrations include a sermon as well as a public meeting, we may even find St. Paul's Cathedral appearing several times in the handbook.

Every now and then some one laments that the May Meetings do not arouse the interest they once did, but there is no actual reason for any doleful outlook. The meetings are certainly increasing in number and in size, and there is no evidence of any decay in enthusiasm, particularly in the case of missionary anniversaries. And on the whole they make a powerful contribution to the religious life of England. Many a country pastor, who has been toiling for twelve lonely months in some out-of-the-way village, makes his pilgrimage to Exeter Hall, and is brought so closely into touch with the great movement of Christian progress that he goes back with a new spirit of cheerful zeal. His visit, though it may be only from Monday to Saturday, is a spiritual tonic. It means something to have had an opportunity of hearing the distinguished preachers and speakers of whom he has read so much; it means much more to have had a quickening of his faith, hope, and love. For it is on this trinity of virtues that Exeter Hall is built. Once remove faith, hope, and love out of the Christian experience, and you might take your pen and run it through every line in the May Meeting program.

Whatever may be said of the "otherworldliness" of the Christian believer, there is nothing in all London more practical than the ministry to the suffering and the fallen which gives an account of its stewardship at these gatherings. And when we ask the laborers themselves what inspires them to this service they have nothing to say but "We love, because He first loved us." So, after all, we must put Exeter Hall on our list of Evidences of Christianity; for Mr. Spurgeon spoke for the universal conscience when he declared, "The God that answereth by orphanages, let him be God."

Herbert W. Howill

ART. X.—THE CORONATION OF THE COMMON PEOPLE.

THE vanishing from the world's stage during the past fifty years of so many gifted and brilliant men has frequently been the subject of special remark and regret. The disappearance of such a constellation of extraordinary characters from the heavens of our poor human world has by some been regarded as a sore calamity, and many are the lamentations which have found expression, especially in the realms to which those supreme spirits belonged. The sadness of the bereavement is all the keener and deeper from the fact that few of all the splendid lights gone out have found any worthy successors to fill the vast spaces they have left behind. The mantles dropped by the great orators, musicians, painters, poets, epoch-making scientists, singers, preachers, and by the men of royal imagination whose creations rouse and hold us as if by some magic and masterly charm, lie here and there unclaimed, and it is certain that the world has passed through the portals of the new century with a singular absence of men of commanding genius in any of the spheres so richly illuminated in the different periods of the past. The regrets that reach us through many voices on the removal of so many of earth's favored sons may be well founded, but while we respect the convictions of men who bemoan the disappearance of the magnificent we do not in any great measure share them. For special reasons we gladly welcome this distinct parenthesis in the annals of the great and the sublime.

The closing of the gates through which processions of brilliant personalities have passed has been the occasion for the opening of wide doors of opportunity for the middling man to show that in this dull dress of commonplace qualifications there is enshrined a man, a mighty factor, an unheralded sovereign, with mandates, authorities, empires all his own. The average man at last has made his advent, and from the present outlook he has come to stay. Too long he has been kept in the shade by the dazzling brightness of a few royally gifted men. Unappreciated, unhonored, the brother of the ordinary talents marches to the front and no command of any proud Caesar can force him back to the bitter

humiliations of former days. Socially, politically, mentally, religiously, the average or middling man has risen, as if by some grand instinct of the new age, to a throne of power. This enfranchisement of the commonplace mortal which enables him to stand up in God's world in his full independent individuality, taking a full, unfettered breath, every time, is an achievement in the development of humanity which ought to inspire our deepest gratitude. But why should the disappearance of so many splendid figures from the active forces of the world furnish a subject rather for quiet congratulation than for moaning regrets? For the simple reason that the middling man may demonstrate the merits and powers that are his and that in due time he may secure his proper place in the direction and government of the world. The average individual is by far the most numerous type in the world's population of this and every age. The genius, the magnificently endowed, and the rank which falls below the ordinary are the extremes and exceptions of mankind. They constitute the outskirts, the capes and promontories of the race, but the great continent of human existence lies between and is made up of the men of ordinary powers. The true strength and real life of the planet is not found in the exceptional climes, the arctic frost or torrid heat, but in temperate lands we find the realm where the grape ripens and the wheat turns yellow in the constant sun. So in the temperate zone of mankind we find the most productive and most reliable source of those forces upon which the world depends for the actualization of its highest aims.

It is also a fact more apparent now than in any other time that by far the largest amount of work, both in the Church and in the world, is being done by the middling or the average man. Goethe has said that God chose the Jew above all others for his toughness, and it would appear that this quality of endurance is possessed by the commonplace mortal in a larger degree than in the other extremes of human life, and this power for holding on to purpose and immense undertakings is a great factor in all the achievements which are pushing the race onward and upward. And what a splendid faculty for common interest and cooperation

is enjoyed by the type of man which sums up such a vast majority of earth's population to-day! The richly gifted, by the very nature of things, are isolated from their fellows. So mighty has the average man become that he possesses a power which means panic or progress in all the great realms which make up the age in which we live. And it is evident that this rising force is the real sovereign which is to rule the twentieth century as commander and dictator of the future destinies of mankind. Carlyle concludes his *Past and Present* with ringing words as he sees the great army of industry, and the gradual lifting of the vast central mass of mankind into power. With sturdy eloquence he exclaims: "This enormous, all-conquering, flame-crowned host is marching to subdue chaos and make this old world worthier of God and more fit for man."

William Harrison

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

PROFESSOR DUGALD MACFADYEN, editor of the Temple Biographies Series, in his introduction to Dr. Edward Dowden's new life of Robert Browning, published by E. P. Dutton & Co., which is "a biography of the Poet's mind," writes:

Browning has become to many, in a measure which he could hardly have conceived possible himself, one of the authoritative interpreters of the spiritual factors in human life. His tonic optimism dissipates the gray atmosphere of materialism, which has obscured the sun-clad heights of life as effectively as a fog. To see life through Browning's eyes is to see it shot through and through with spiritual issues, with a background of eternal destiny, and to come appreciably nearer than the general consciousness of our time to seeing it steadily and seeing it whole. Those who prize his influence know how to value everything which throws light on the path by which he reached his resolute and confident outlook.

Because that statement is entirely true of Browning, as of no other modern poet, we have for years conceived it to be a high duty to assist in giving vogue to his robust and peremptory faith, his resolute and confident gospel, in comparison with the priceless value of which all criticisms of his eccentricities of style are so academic and trivial as not to concern mankind.

AN INCORRIGIBLE BLUNDER IN GRAMMAR.

FOURTEEN years ago the following appeared in a New York city newspaper:

MISUSE OF THE PRONOUN "WHOM."

To the Editor of the Tribune.

SIR: How do you explain the fact that one of the most obvious violations of grammar is so frequently found in high quarters, even in stately reviews and newspapers that pride themselves on their correct English? Here are specimens:

In an article on marriage and divorce in a religious review a man "denies that he ever intended to marry the woman whom lawyers endeavored to prove was his first wife." Whom was. Her was not.

In the report of an accident a man is described as "searching for his daughter whom he thought might have been saved." Whom might. Her was not saved, you see.

In the investigation of a case of arson a man testifies that the house "had been purchased by Harry Baker, a man whom the State says has no existence." Him may have been dead.

A Long Branch report speaks of a clergyman "whom Christian scientists claim has shown a leaning toward their beliefs." Whom showed.

A letter from the revered object of a certain cult runs thus: "Dear Sir: I have not in my possession a picture such as you desire, but I will send your letter to a photographer in Washington whom I presume will furnish it to you." Whom will. But perhaps him did not write this sentence just as printed. If so let he look to the proofreader whom did it. So plain and inexcusable a mistake ought not to be so common. Will *The Tribune* help to correct it?

St. John's Church, Brooklyn, July 4, 1890.

WILLIAM V. KELLEY.

(*The Tribune* will, cheerfully.—ED.)

A few days later the editor of the *Tribune* replied to a counter-critic and objector thus:

"W. A. L." writes to take exception to one of the several admirably selected examples of the misuse of the pronoun "whom," selected by Dr. Kelley and pointed out in a letter to *The Tribune*, recently published. "W. A. L." says: "In the first case, we think he is mistaken. Will the doctor please reconsider his statement, and look at another word in the sentence?" No, Dr. Kelley was not "mistaken." Why should he reconsider his statement? The sentence which he quotes reads: "The man denies that he ever intended to marry the woman whom lawyers endeavored to prove was his first wife." Whom could never be the subject of "was," if it lived till the blast of Gabriel's trumpet was sounded. Just punctuate after "woman" and "prove." Read it this way: "The man denies that he ever intended to marry the woman whom (lawyers endeavored to prove) was his first wife." Pretty bad, isn't it?

In spite of all corrections and protests this gross and glaring blunder in grammar mysteriously persists, undaunted and undiminished by criticism. It seems utterly incorrigible. Intelligence appears to be no protection against it, and the most finical purists often walk straight into its snare. Nobody is surprised when the *New York Journal* reports that "the man *whom* the police believe sent the blackmail letters to a wealthy druggist has been arraigned," for bad grammar may be expected of yellow journalism. Nor does any sense of wonder overcome us when the manager of the football team in an Eastern college sends out to principals of preparatory schools a request for "the names and data of any good athletes *whom* you know *will be ready* to enter college next September." We can even bear it, if not excuse it, when the business manager of a great review asks us to send him the names of a few of our friends *whom* we feel *would be interested* in his review. It might seem unfeeling to criticise a request so feelingly expressed. But it gives us a shock to find a stern reformer of abuses, a merciless censor of human

errors, infirmities, and infelicities, an icily proper pink of perfection, like the *Springfield Republican*, printing on August 24, 1903, this editorial paragraph:

The Humberts, the greatest swindlers of a century, get five years in a French prison; yet madame goes down with colors flying, repeating to the end that the Crawford millions do exist. M. Labori has furnished the only other feature of interest in the trial by showing that, as a lawyer, he could defend a supreme scoundrel, whom he knew to be guilty, with as much eloquence and zest as he could a Dreyfus, *whom* he had every reason to believe *was innocent*.

Perhaps the dog-days did it. Even the loftiest critic is liable to nod in mid-August. And one does not expect to find in stately and scholarly reviews sentences resembling the invitations sent out by Chuck Connors, the "King of the Bowery Boys," the "Mayor of Chinatown," asking his unwashed friends to his annual ball at Tammany Hall; invitations which are fairly described as being "couched in carefully ungrammatical English." Yet in so brilliant a review as the *International Quarterly*, on page 251 of the issue of September, 1903, an article on Herman Grimm quotes Professor Grimm as saying of Goethe, "Without abdicating our intellectual independence, we may yet devote ourselves to him *whom* we feel *has* a legitimate right to our services." (Whom has a right! Why not write and punctuate it properly? *Who*, we feel, *has* a right.) Again, in the same great review, on page 234, December, 1903, Louis Lucipia, in an article on "The Paris Commune of 1871," quotes Jules Favre as saying, "I have heard men *whom* I thought *were* sane and intelligent declare that the best thing to do was to take their wives and children and let them all be killed." (Whom were!) We are reminded of a notice which a friend saw on the summit of the Rigi above Lake Lucerne, posted in the corridor of a hotel which always wakes its guests in time to see the sun rise, the literal translation of which is, "Messieurs and venerable voyagers are hereby advertised that when the sun him do rise a horn will be blowed." This is an exact rendering of French idiom, but is intolerable English. We wish "a horn" might "be blowed" announcing the rising of a day in the light of which a blunder which any schoolboy in the first grammar class should be able to avoid may disappear at least from the higher circles of literature and culture, and never be heard from any presumably educated pulpit. The misuse of "whom" for "who" is due partly to lack of clear thinking and careful attention, partly to a failure to punctuate properly. A notable correction of this misuse is seen in Mark viii, verses 27 and 29 (as also in the corresponding passage in

Luke ix, verses 18 and 20) as printed in the Revised Version of the Bible. The King James Version has it, "Whom do men say that I am?" and "Whom say ye that I am?" It is impossible to parse "whom" in these verses. There is no rule of grammar which can be stretched or twisted so as to justify or permit its use. There is no verb of which "whom" can be the object, nor any infinitive to which it can stand as subject. And the translators of the Revised Version did not need to be expert grammarians in order to be able to make the grammar respectable by rendering the verses, "Who do men say that I am?" and "Who say ye that I am?" Any graduate from a public school ought to be able to make so simple and necessary a correction. The "split infinitive," as it is called, which consists in inserting an adverb into the infinitive form where it does not belong, as in saying "to kindly request" instead of "kindly to request" or "to request kindly," is a far less grievous mistake, being only a question of the proper location and order of the words in a sentence, and not of rendering the sentence utterly unparsable.

While upon this subject we may admit a communication referring to another very common mistake:

SIR: The symposium of grammarians in *The Tribune* has been entertaining and instructive. I did not feel willing to intrude among the banqueters, but now that the symposium is at an end you might let me in, under the pretense of bringing in the apollinaris on a waiter.

Can anyone explain the universal practice of mislocating in a sentence the word "only"?—"I only paid a dollar," "He only slept an hour," "They only heard it once." The *Saturday Globe* before me says: "Dead! and you and I were only talking of him last night!"—apparently intimating that their mere talk could not possibly have killed him. In another paper this catches my eye: "One site which cost \$10,000 was only purchased last June;" that it was not paid for, or possessed, but merely purchased. Any number of similar sentences can be clipped from a pile of newspapers. In current literature the error is very common. Frederick Anstey says in *Tariah*, which I am reading at the moment, "She only came back last night," and so anyone who asserts that she went away again is mistaken. In fact, this queer mode of expression has imbedded itself firmly in our common speech. Very few persons on the platform or in conversation put the word "only" where it properly belongs. Why? How came the language by this bad sprain?

S. H. MEAD.

Eustis, Fla.

(Undoubtedly this long-suffering word is often misplaced. It should be as near as possible to the word or words it qualifies. In the first example given the word is so placed as to indicate that the speaker alone paid a dollar; but if the meaning be, as it doubtless is, that only a dollar was paid, the sentence should read, "I paid only a dollar." The same remarks apply to the second, which should read, "They heard it only once;" the third should read, "Only last night;" the fourth, "Was purchased only last June;" and Mr. Anstey should have said that "She came back only last night," unless he meant that she came alone, or that she did nothing else besides coming.—ED.)

We also transcribe a letter which protests against overfastidiousness and finical purism:

SIR: I have myself been called a purist, and I certainly detest corruptions of English speech; but I must say that I am made very weary by the finicky criticisms of some who, while using without question numerous current barbarisms, object with hair-splitting logic to such well-established and expressive idioms as "higher up," "lower down," "further on," "gather together," and the like. The translators of our English Bible were pretty good masters of English speech, and they did not hesitate to say, "Friend, go up higher," just as St. Jerome, in the Vulgate, had said before them, "Amice, ascende superius." Milton, too, in *Paradise Lost*, wrote, "Ascend up to our native seat." The biblical translators again wrote, "When He had gathered together," and Burton, in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, gave us the proverbial saying, "Birds of a feather will gather together"—which is almost invariably misquoted "flock together." It would be far better for would-be language reformers to quit such "egregious folly of purism," and pay attention to suppressing real evils, such as "sending a wireless," "electrocuting," and "making a combine." Yet I know people who habitually use these latter expressions but regard "higher up" with holy horror.

W. F. J.

New York, February 2, 1904.

Whatever force be conceded to this protesting letter, no one can accuse us of purism or fastidiousness in our protest against the misuse of "whom" for "who," which is a most flagrant mistake as indefensible as it seems incurable. Strange that so elementary a matter should ever need to be expounded and emphasized in educated circles!

THE BIBLE SOCIETY CENTENNIAL.

ONE of the most important events in the religious annals of the present year is the centennial of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The founding of this society just one hundred years ago marked the inauguration of what has been fitly called the greatest literary enterprise of the Christian era. What grander, nobler undertaking can be imagined than to give the pure word of God without note or comment, the source of unspeakable temporal and spiritual blessings, to all the millions of mankind? It is no wonder that the project once started speedily fired the hearts of multitudes, and enlisted the hearty cooperation of men of all creeds. The only marvel is that it was not entered upon before. The story of the origin has been often told, yet it deserves a brief rehearsal here. A venerable clergyman and a little girl seem to have been the prime factors in initiating the movement. The Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala, a town in Merionethshire, Wales, a man fully given to good works, fertile in expedients for God, saintly, indefatigable, apostolic, was the main instrumentality. There

is no question concerning the world's indebtedness to him. Nor is the nature of the little girl's part doubtful, although her precise personality is not altogether clear. In fact, there would appear to have been at least two girls who figure quite significantly in the narrative that has come down to us. Possibly when the mysterious processes of higher criticism have been sufficiently exercised upon the incident the two may resolve themselves into one, and the part which tradition has played with fact may be brought plainly to view. But at present it is not plain. According to one account—given in *The Book and Its Story*, put forth at the Jubilee of the Bible Society—as Mr. Charles was walking the streets of Bala he met a child who attended his ministry. He inquired if she could recite the text from which he had preached on the previous Sunday; she was silent, and the inquiry was repeated. At length she answered, "The weather has been so bad that I could not get to read the Bible." The reason of this was soon ascertained: there was no copy to which she could gain access, either at her own home or among her friends; and she was accustomed to walk seven miles over the hills every week to a place where she could obtain a Welsh Bible, for the purpose of reading the chapter from which the minister took his text. According to another account, which may be the same in a slightly different dress, and which is the more usually told, the girl, Mary Jones by name, being without a Bible—as were most of the people at that time, for there was a veritable famine of the word—and longing to possess one, set herself in right good earnest honestly to earn it. For six years she toiled and prayed and saved, and then with a brave heart full of hope, but with bare brown feet, she walked twenty-five miles from her home to Bala to buy the sacred book from Mr. Charles. But, alas! the good pastor had to tell her that the only unsold copy in his possession was already promised to another, and she had to walk back those weary twenty-five miles almost broken-hearted. It is also told us that twelve Welsh peasants subscribed together to purchase a copy of the Bible which was to circulate among the hills. Each family was to keep it a month and then pass it on. When it arrived among them an old man, who had been the last subscriber, finding his name at the end of the list, wept bitterly, saying, "Alas, it will be twelve months before it comes to me, and I dare say I shall be gone before that time into another world." From these and other incidents, which might be related, it is evident that the destitution of Bibles was appalling, such as might well give rise to energetic efforts for an improved situation.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, established in 1698, was at this time the main source of Bible supply, although there were a few other associations of similar character which did a little in the same line. And this society in 1799 printed ten thousand Welsh Bibles, but they were no sooner published than sold, and not a fourth part of the country was furnished. No more from that quarter was to be hoped for, and there was urgent need that something be done. Societies of one kind and another were just then decidedly in the air. The Religious Tract Society had just been started; also, in the few previous years, the Baptist Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, and the Church Missionary Society. And it occurred to Mr. Charles one morning, as he lay wakeful upon his bed, thinking upon the hard necessities of Wales, Why not a society solely for Bible distribution? He hurried to London and laid it before the next meeting of the Tract Society. Whereupon the Rev. Joseph Hughes, one of the secretaries, after expressing his approval of the idea, said, "And if for Wales, why not for the empire and the world?" The meeting cordially agreed, and instructed its secretary to follow up the suggestion. A letter was prepared which called together about three hundred persons of many denominations at the London Tavern, March 7, 1804, and they speedily effected the establishment of the Bible Society, "the first institution," as Mr. Hughes said, "that ever emanated from one of the nations of Europe for the express purpose of doing good to all the rest." Seven hundred pounds was subscribed upon the spot. In Wales, which rejoiced exceedingly at the good news, and which was soon abundantly furnished with Scriptures, nineteen hundred pounds was contributed the first year, mainly, it is noted, "from the lower orders of people." The noble and the good rallied round this inspiring banner, especially "the men of Clapham," William Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay, Granville Sharp, and the rest of that illustrious band. An Executive Committee of thirty-six laymen was constituted, the membership fee was fixed at one guinea, and Lord Teignmouth was chosen president. The society, it may be remarked, has been most happy in its presidents. They have been only five in number. Lord Teignmouth, a former governor-general of India, devoted his best energies to this cause for thirty years. His successor was Lord Bexley, who served for seventeen years, followed by the Earl of Shaftesbury in 1851, who highly prized the honor of the position and filled it conspicuously well for thirty-five years; then came the Earl of Harrowby, who gave the society fourteen years' dis-

tinguished services, closed by his death in 1900. The Marquis of Northampton now worthily fills out this illustrious succession of most honorable names. What hath God wrought through this agency and the similar ones which have since been set in motion mainly by its example! Figures but faintly indicate it. Yet they are eloquent. In its hundred years the British and Foreign Bible Society has circulated in round numbers 187,000,000 Bibles, Testaments, and Scripture portions; the American Bible Society, in its eighty-eight years, over 74,000,000; the Scotch, in its forty-four years, about 24,000,000—making 285,000,000 for these three alone. For the many other minor societies which act independently of these we have not the precise figures at hand, but it would be perfectly safe to set them down at 15,000,000 more, thus making the grand total of 300,000,000 copies of some vital part of the word of the living God sent out during the century by this means alone, to say nothing of what has been done by private firms. The British Society now distributes about six million copies a year—one million Bibles, one and a half million Testaments, three and a half million portions—the American about two millions, and the Scotch about one million. But there is, of course, also an enormous sale from private publishing houses, like that of the Bagsters, the Cambridge and Oxford University Presses, and a vast number of others, many of whom do nothing but issue Bibles. Twelve million copies a year is probably not too large an estimate for the total output at the present time, when so many revised versions are thronging the market. And when it is remembered that there were not more than five or six million copies of the Bible in existence at the beginning of the last century the progress can be readily discerned, and may well call forth heartiest praise. At the beginning of the last century the Bible was current in about forty different languages. Fifty translations are said to have been in existence, but only thirty-five were in living languages, and the entire Bible was by no means in all of these. The long, slow struggle of eighteen hundred years had led to this meager result. There had been gradually added to the original Hebrew and Greek, to the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch, the ancient Syriac, the old Latin and the Vulgate. Then, after a time, it became credible that the sacred writers could be made to speak in the modern tongues. The Bible was the first of Russian books, as it had been the first of Gothic, and the first of Armenian. Germany in 1466 obtained its earliest Scriptures in the vernacular; Italy soon followed, in 1471; France in 1474; Bohemia in 1488. The

printing press started its wonderful career with the Mazarin Bible 1450. Twenty editions of the Latin Bible had been printed in Germany alone before Luther was born; and in 1517 the fourteenth known issue of a German Bible took place—these fourteen issues being not mere reprints, but various translations from the Vulgate. In 1516 Erasmus's Greek Testament appeared. Luther grounded his great Reformation in the marvelously effective version of the Scriptures which he wrought, in 1522, which is still standard. The English Wyclife (his new Testament appeared in 1378) and his successors, culminating in Tyndale, gained this great boon of the Gospel story in their mother tongue. But it was seventy-five years after the first printed Latin Bible before the English had even a printed New Testament in their own language, and that was imported from the Continent. In 1536 the English clergy were ordered to put an English Bible and a Latin Bible in the choir of every parish church, that every man who chose might read therein; but not until some years later did any Englishman or Scotchman hear the Bible read in his own tongue as part of the public service.

How different the state of things now! Dr. Dennis, in his *Centennial Survey of Foreign Missions*, gives as the total of all living versions (including transliterations) in use at present by people of all languages and dialects, 452. His figures, in some respects the fullest yet gathered, show a total of 478 missionary translations, only ten of them issued before the nineteenth century. He reckons also six principal ancient versions, and sixteen standard modern versions, thus giving 478 ancient and modern, living and obsolete, Bible translations. Taking out 46 as obsolete, and adding the 20 transliterated versions now in use would give the 452 mentioned above. But since these figures were collected some three years ago they are subject to quite a little addition; for no less than eight new versions—Fioti, Kikuyu, Shambala, Karanga, Nogogu, Laevo, Baffins Land Eskimo, and Madurese—have been added during the past year by the British Society alone. No year passes without some additions; and the list of versions issued by the British Society now includes the names of three hundred and seventy distinct forms of speech. Its first volume, singularly enough, was for the Indians of the Mohawk River. It sent them two thousand copies of the Gospel of St. John bound in calf. Its final volume will not be issued until the judgment angel shall proclaim that all activities in this probationary world must cease. Nor will there be, until a period now apparently very remote, any

cessation in the strenuous effort to overtake the very large number of tongues and dialects as yet unsupplied with the word. The need is still very great. Within the borders of the Indian empire alone no versions of Scripture exist in one hundred and eight languages used by seventy-four million souls. In the islands of Polynesia and Malaysia and on the upper waters of the Amazon there are hundreds of dialects in which the Scriptures have never spoken. If there are, as Dr. Cust estimates, two thousand languages in the world, then at least one thousand five hundred of them have not been honored by the word of inspiration; and probably half of these are sufficiently important to merit it. Out of the translations of the Scriptures now existent in living tongues no fewer than two hundred and nineteen have been made in languages which have been reduced to writing for the purpose within the present century. The missionaries of the American Board alone have taken twenty-nine unwritten languages and reduced them to writing to put the Bible into them, in part or in whole. Scores of tribes in Africa use languages the very names of which are scarce known to us. The Lolo is spoken by ten millions of people on the equatorial tributaries of the Congo. There are vast tracts where different dialects are met every ten or fifteen miles. In some lands by no means wholly barbarous the diversity of tongues is enormous and amazing. The Bible Society agents sold Scriptures last year in 53 languages of the Russian empire, 20 of the Austrian empire, 28 in Burma, 30 in South Malaysia, 53 in the Egyptian agency stretching from Antioch to Uganda, and 14 in Cape Town alone. It can from these facts be at least somewhat understood what an unending and Herculean task is assigned to the translation and revision departments supervised and financed by the Bible Society; also to the colportage and distribution department. This latter maintained last year a total colportage staff of 870, who sold 1,830,000 copies, a gain of 90,000 over the highest previous record. The society also supports 685 native Christian Bible women, who minister to their neglected and secluded sisters in Eastern lands. Controlled by the translation department about one thousand representative missionaries and native assistants are at work in different countries under the society's auspices, and largely at its expense. It lays out some five thousand pounds a year on this work, and has from the beginning spent in it about five hundred thousand pounds. Translation work is now being carried on in one hundred and thirty-seven languages. And so the word of God goes flying all abroad.

The connection of the Bible Society and the Missionary Society, as will readily be inferred, is of the most intimate character. What could either do without the other? Their mutual relations are of the closest kind. The Bible Society relies upon the missionaries to translate and circulate its multiplied versions. The missionaries depend upon the Bible Society for supplies of that which is of the highest importance in their work. And the Bible Society deals with them in the most liberal manner. It sends out the books that are needed free of cost and carriage paid; in return, the missionaries remit to the Bible House any proceeds arising from the copies which they sell, after deducting the expenses of circulation. At best only a small fraction of what the Bible Society expends on the preparation and delivery of these missionary versions can ever come back to it as the result of such sales, while the missionaries obtain all the Scriptures they require without any cost whatever to their own societies. In ten years the grants from the Bible Society to one missionary organization amounted to not less than one thousand eight hundred pounds, while the missionaries returned to the society only about fifty pounds. To the London Missionary Society the Bible Society furnishes the Scriptures in over fifty different languages, to the Wesleyans in over forty, the Presbyterians use about sixty different versions, while the Church Missionary Society, which uses more than a hundred translations, gets full ninety of them from the Bible Society. Where the missionary himself, for special reasons, cannot go, the colporteur and the Bible are often allowed, and the Bible alone has frequently penetrated, with most beneficial effect, to otherwise inaccessible regions. Grants of Scriptures are also made freely to the home lands, through auxiliaries and branches, which in England number 5,875. Especial attention is paid to providing Scriptures for the blind, and soldiers are particularly looked after. In the Russo-Turkish struggle 478,000 copies were sent to the seat of hostilities, and in the South African war 133,000 to the belligerents on both sides. It can well be seen, perhaps, even from this hurried presentation, that every Bible Society stands in urgent need of funds. As a business undertaking it cannot be supported without a wide departure from usual financial principles. It is deliberately run at a loss. And the greater the demand for the Scriptures the greater the outlay necessitated. Since the foundation of the British Society it has disbursed over £14,000,000. Its total net payments last year were £254,204, while its net receipts from all sources were £233,138. During the last five years it has expended

£60,000 more than it has received. And a fund of 250,000 guineas is imperatively demanded (and it is hoped may be raised before the month or the year shall close) to prevent any curtailing of the society's beneficent operations.

It is earnestly to be hoped also that the American Bible Society, only twelve years younger than its British sister, and every way worthy to stand beside her in all respects, may reap substantial profit from this year's renewed interest in the noble cause she represents. The resources of this society have been seriously diminished of late from a variety of reasons. Its former income has been largely depleted by the increasing appeals for denominational causes and for local charities. Its work is easily forgotten because done so quietly and out of sight. A false impression that the society is rich has hurt it not a little. Its entire income from investments and rents is only enough to carry on its work for six weeks. It needs at least two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year from the Christian churches, and it is by no means getting it. The benevolent receipts for the last year fell about fifty thousand dollars below the average for the last ten years. Unless large special gifts are received at once the work will be greatly damaged by the cessation of agencies, the dismissal of tried workers, and the stopping of the presses. Surely this cannot be allowed. It would be a disgrace to American Christianity with its large and constantly increasing wealth. This society has employed during the past year in foreign lands 447 persons to distribute Scriptures. Some have been remarkably successful. In the Philippine agency the circulation has nearly doubled over the previous year, reaching a total of 91,260. In Porto Rico the circulation has been 10,000 copies as against 3,000 the year before. The total issues in foreign fields were 1,258,909, with 731,649 in the United States. It works in 100 languages, including 28 European, 39 Asiatic, 9 African, and 12 American. The total receipts for 1903 were \$412,406, of which only \$98,085 were gifts from the living, and \$53,926 were in legacies. Each of these important sources of income, especially the first, should be at once doubled.

The history of Bible work in America has peculiar interest for us, and deserves more than the page we can give it. So long as the colonists were subject to Great Britain all their supplies of Scriptures were imported. During the Revolutionary War such was the scarcity of Bibles that Congress in 1777 voted to print thirty thousand copies; and when it was found impracticable, from want of type and paper,

it directed the Committee on Commerce to import twenty thousand from Europe, giving as a reason that "its use was so universal and its importance so great." When this too, in consequence of the embargo, was found impracticable Congress passed a resolution (1782) in favor of an edition of the Bible published by the private enterprise of Mr. Robert Aitken, of Philadelphia, which it pronounced "a pious and laudable undertaking subservient to the interests of religion." But in spite of such high congressional indorsement this first English Bible printed in America—a small 18mo, a book so rare that a copy has been sold in modern days for six hundred and fifty dollars—was produced by its publisher at a loss of three thousand dollars in specie. From 1790 onward many editions were brought out by publishers in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Trenton, Worcester, and elsewhere. They were, however, inadequate for the wants of the growing republic, besides being sold at prices beyond the reach of the poor. After the starting of the British Society in 1804, kindred associations were soon organized in different parts of this country, but they were local, independent bodies, having no connection nor intercommunication. The Philadelphia Bible Society was established in 1808, and the London Committee at once voted it a donation of one thousand dollars and sent it consignments of Scriptures at cost price. Six years later the number of Bible societies and kindred associations in the States had increased to sixty-nine. In 1815 the Bible Society of New Jersey, prompted by the venerable Elias Boudinot, its president (formerly president of the Congress of the United States), issued a circular to the several Bible societies in the country inviting them to send delegates to meet in the city of New York the ensuing year. The New York and Philadelphia societies entered cordially into the measure. A convention was held in New York in May, 1816, composed of sixty delegates representing thirty-five Bible societies in ten States. Dr. Boudinot was chosen president, and a full organization readily effected. The receipts of the society the first year were \$37,779, and its issues 6,410 volumes. For the first period of twenty-five years it issued 2,798,366 volumes; for the second period, 18,987,210; for the third 32,478,138; for the fourth period, if the present rate be continued, the total will reach 50,000,000. Again and again the society has carried out the colossal undertaking of canvassing the entire country, with the aim of visiting every family. As the result of two of these costly and protracted efforts the entire number of families reported to be visited was 11,764,416, and out of 1,299,150 of these

that were found destitute of the Bible 850,061 were supplied by sale or gift, and 598,924 persons besides. More than one half of its annual issues go into the hands of pagan, Mohammedan, or nominally Christian people outside of the United States. Last year 561,040 were sold in China alone, and more than 8,000,000 volumes in the various dialects of that empire have been printed during the last fifty years. It is supposed that at least 2,000,000 were sold there last year by the British Society alone and at least 3,000,000 by all agencies, so unprecedented is the demand. In the neighboring empire of Japan, where the three great societies have for the last ten years been united in their operations, over one million copies have been distributed. These are but instances of how the world is opening more and more to the word of God. It is not now a crime to circulate the Bible anywhere. Religious liberty increasingly prevails. In 1886 a ton of Bibles was condemned to be publicly burned in the capital of Ecuador. Now the colporteurs are welcomed in all parts of South America. Even the Roman Catholic Church is reversing as rapidly as could fairly be expected its age-long policy of denying the Scriptures to the common people. Popes send out encyclicals urging the universal study of the word of the Lord. Most significant is it that the Society of St. Jerome, composed of Roman Catholics, is, with the pope's approval and with Bible society methods, putting the Scriptures into the hands of the common people of Italy. One hundred and seventy thousand copies of the Gospels and Acts in one volume, at four cents in paper covers and eight cents in cloth, have rapidly been sold. This is a new, scholarly, and simple translation from the original Greek.

The twentieth century starts out magnificently well as a patron and promoter of the blessed book. It inherits from the nineteenth a vast accumulation of material and a wonderfully improved apparatus for work patiently procured at large expense. It takes over also a profound and abiding conviction that the Bible is a mighty force which God has appointed for the use of his Church in the discharge of its duty to the world, a potent factor in the world's deepest, highest life, and the mightiest of helps to the evangelization of the nations. It cannot be questioned that in Christian lands the Scriptures are more carefully studied than ever before in the world's history. It is true that they are studied sometimes in a way that troubles timid souls. But the studies and conclusions of scholars concerning authorship, dates, and species of composition, or literary

forms, relate simply to the settings of the truth, not to the truth itself. They do not affect the eternal, the essential, the experimental. Prime Minister Balfour said last year at the inaugural centennial meeting of the Bible Society at the Mansion House, London, "The researches of critics have made the Bible far more a living record of the revelation of God to mankind than it ever was or ever could be to those who, from the nature of the case, had no adequate conception of the circumstances under which the revelation occurred, or the peoples to whom it was revealed. And I most truly think that not only is the Bible now what it has always been to the unlearned, a source of consolation, of hope, of instruction, but it is to those who are more learned augmented in interest and not diminished, a more valuable source of spiritual life now than it could ever have been in the pre-critical days." With this most modern scholars agree.

The Bible is indeed the book above every book, in whose pages God is met as he is met nowhere else. It has a vitality which nothing can touch. Twenty years ago the circulation of the Scriptures in Germany amounted to ten copies per thousand of the population. Last year it amounted to eighteen copies per thousand. While learned men have discussed and doubted and even denied, the German people have doubled their purchases of the precious volume. It is the book of all saints, in whose revelations men have found, and are still finding, the best discipline for Christian character. It is the book of converts, making them in most marvelous ways out of raw heathen, and then still further training them into righteousness and true holiness. It is the book of the progressive nations, of those which have the largest colonizing and civilizing energies, of those which are certain more and more to dominate the earth. It is the reconciler of differences, the healer of breaches, the promoter of union among Christians above any other instrumentality, breaking down the middle walls of partition and bringing about spiritual intercommunion of the churches. It is the only universal book, the book of unvarying victories, the book of most magnificent achievements. Through centuries it has withstood countless storms, it has survived countless foes, and remains the only book wherein God speaks the eternal message which satisfies the needs and aspirations of the human soul.

Captains and conquerors leave a little dust,
And kings a dubious legend of their reign;
The swords of Cæsar, they are less than dust;
The Bible doth remain.

THE ARENA.

MAN GREATER THAN NATURE.

How insignificant is man! It is only as we think of human insignificance and frailty that we get a startling conception of man's superiority and power.

There is a disposition in some minds to belittle man, and reduce him to such absurd insignificance in the universe as to nullify the importance of human conduct and destiny, and to escape the notice of the Creator. Think of man, therefore, in his physical structure. The body comprises but thirteen of the seventy-two simple substances. A French chemist tells us the average man is composed of a few pounds of oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, a few ounces of phosphorus, calcium, chlorine, and salt, a few pinches of silica, sulphur, potassium, magnesia, and iron. How closely akin is man to the clods in the field! Stop and reflect. What do a few pounds of earthy substances amount to in comparison with the mighty volume of the earth, or the huge frame of the shining sun? What is one human being among all the multiplied billions of beings on the numberless planets of space? In a universe of fathomless spaces, of immeasurable forces, of worlds without number, what is man? What are human achievements? What is man's destiny? A "mere mote of dust in the sunbeam of time." A mere ripple in the ocean of immensity. A dream—and a forgetting.

How insignificant is man! Weak and puny is his arm compared with the elastic strength of the greater brutes, or with the power of the tempest, or the might of the earthquake. How frail is man! His body, composed of a few simple substances, endures perhaps for threescore years and ten, and then crumbles into dust, but the giant fir and the lordly redwood tower aloft for a thousand years; and the snow-capped peak stands a mute sentinel while continents endure; and the stars shine on while men and mountains pass away. The mind of man, how frail! So subject to hope and fear, to truth and error, and so limited in its powers that it knows but little of the infinite kingdom of knowledge. The skeptic thus muses upon man, and reduces him to a vanishing infinitesimal, and laughs moral responsibility out of existence, as such an exceedingly small matter. Some take a flippant view of human existence, but while man in a sense is insignificant, we should take a more reverent view even of his insignificance. When we consider the size of the human body, the brevity of its earthly life, the limitations of its powers, in comparison with sizes, and durations, and forces in the universe around us, well may we be overwhelmed with the thought of human littleness—but in the very insignificance of man do we find hidden his most startling superiority. Stop and reflect. The revolving earth is a mere pygmy in comparison with man, as the earth belongs to the kingdom of matter, but man belongs in the kingdom of mind. Mere earth, whether at rest or in motion, is inert; it must continue in its

state of rest or motion until acted upon by some external force. But consider man. He has life, consciousness, and volition. He is able to originate motion. Man is, in this, far superior to the material world. The giant forces of nature, gravity, steam, electricity, are but dwarfs when compared with man. These natural forces operate from the laws of necessity, but man is free to act or not to act. Nature's forces, then, are subject to necessity, while man has freedom. Moreover, these gods of the materialist fall before man, for in his superiority he makes them his servants to do his bidding. Man, "the mote of dust in the sunbeam of time," is mightier than the earth upon which he treads, or the sun which shines upon him, or the skies which bend over his head. These belong to the realm of the inert, lifeless, unconscious, unthinking, and are ruled by necessity, while man dwells in the nobler kingdom of mind and is endowed with life, volition, intelligence, moral consciousness, and has freedom. Even the earthworm is mightier than the planet in which it grovels, for it possesses the physical qualities of inert matter, but it possesses something more. It possesses life and volition and knowledge. Although the materialistic thinker laughs man into nothingness, from the intellectual standpoint man holds dominion over the earth, its treasures and forces.

How insignificant is man—yet how superior! Man's superiority over the kingdom of nature appears in three great facts: In physical structure he stands at the head of earthly creatures. He is provided with feet, enabling him to move from place to place, but with hands free to perform the many tasks and inventions of daily life. In his mental powers man is far superior to all his contemporaries. He is able to do for himself many things nature has left undone. Nature teaches the brute by instinct, but man lives and triumphs by the powers of reason. He adapts himself to the various conditions of climate, the diversity of natural productions, and makes his home in every land from the regions of perpetual summer to the shores of the frozen ocean. He conquers the forest and plain and ocean, and wrings from them the comforts and luxuries of life. Talk about the insignificance of man! The supremacy of man's mind and the skill of his hand are seen in the march of science and the riches of art. But the crowning superiority of man over the material universe lies in his moral consciousness, and likeness unto his Creator. We conceive of the Creator on high, beholding the circling worlds, which are obedient to the behests of law. We think of him peering into the kingdom of living things, and observing their thrift and their enjoyment. We imagine him contemplating man. It is not too much to think the Supreme Mind rejoices in the mathematical movements of the starry universe and in the prosperity of the lower kingdoms of life. It is fair to presume God rejoices as he contemplates man, a being able to think God's thoughts, to apprehend the glory of virtue, and to commune with the Creator and reciprocate his love. The creature that responds to the attraction of virtue and of love is vastly superior to the creature that can respond only to the attraction of gravitation. Right here we plainly see the towering superiority of man over the material world and the hosts of the stellar spaces.

Roseburg, Ore.

GEORGE H. BENNETT.

THE REVIVAL IN CHURCH AND COLLEGE.

A good pastor and able preacher writes: "The work done in revivals of religion is not to be compared in quality with the work done by churches in their ordinary methods. Hand-picked fruit keeps the best." Abstractly, the statement concerning the careful picking of fruit, for good keeping, is true, but the analogy is not so good when applied to saving men. Experience has not always confirmed the theory that men brought into the church through the ordinary routine work are better than those who have been brought in through a genuine spiritual awakening. It is the glory of Methodism that the old-time revival of religion, attended ordinarily with deep feeling, rooted the people, where it occurred, out of old soil into new. Excitement there was, to be sure, but what of that? There must needs be excitement where children are born—travail, labor, great excitement indeed, and agony, ending in much joy. These strenuous things seem inseparable from life; and is it not better so? Can anything be worse than chronic barrenness; or the going on of a church from year to year in a condition of dead propriety, with all the fountains of feeling smothered and drying up? It may come to pass some day, possibly, that piety itself shall be carried to a level so high, so systematized, purified, and understood, as to become less fitful, less disposed to moods, but that time has certainly not yet arrived. As things now are, there is no time and no condition under which wicked men, living habitually in low sensual moods, feel or see so keenly, and truly, as when under the stimulus of a genuine revival of religion. Such men are so dense they have to be slugged into a spiritual fact, before they can see it, and if they ever get to the brink of a decision, they have to be shoved over, or else they draw back. This is the only way left. Many eminent saints have thus entered the Christian way.

Nor is this all: It is believed that the experience of every Christian teacher in our earlier Methodist colleges, like old Augusta College, Kentucky, the first Methodist Episcopal college in the United States, where John P. Durbin, Martin Ruter, Bascom, and other able men gave instruction, turning out such men as Peter Akers (afterward president of McKendree College), Randolph S. Foster, John W. Locke (likewise one of the presidents of McKendree), John Miley, Colonel Hatch, and others of but little less note, and the Ohio Wesleyan, which is Augusta College transferred across the Ohio River into free soil, retaining all the virtues of the old plant and adding many excellencies thereto. In these schools the annual revival was, and is still, considered practically to be a part of the regular curriculum, in order that the ideals set forth may be reduced to practical life.

In fact, it seems to be well understood by the men in charge of our Church schools, both East and West, that the college student passes through a certain transitional state, of a speculative tendency, liable to unsettle him in matters of Christian faith, the antidote for which is the Spirit of God working coordinately with human reason in the study of the sciences and philosophy. Nothing short of this anchors the young man during college life. Aaron Burr, the young grandson of Jonathan Edwards, just

at this stage of student life was spiritually and morally wrecked by the counsel of an infidel physician of the town, to whom young Burr went while under conviction in a college awakening. At such times the revival, deep and pungent, opens the mind and heart of the young man as the plow opens the field ready for things to be planted. This the commonplace methods of church work do not always accomplish.

Portland, Ore.

C. E. CLINE.

"AN EDUCATED MINISTRY" AGAIN.

ONE who has pondered considerably the very thought presented in the *Methodist Review* of January-February, in the "Arena" department, by Rev. Frank Seeds, on the subject, "An Educated Ministry," and the so-called "correction" of Rev. J. A. Boatman in the March-April *Review*, cannot help but think that often a "correction" is merely stating another phase of the subject and, in this case, is considering the letter but missing the spirit. It may seem assumption to say this, but looking carefully at the former article we read such expressions as "mental training," "taste cultivated," "mind until awakened cannot grow," "unfold brain power," "brain culture," etc. These expressions surely show a broad conception of the meaning of education. But directly considering the expression in apparent dispute, namely, "Education means a drawing out of the powers and forces of the mind," nowhere therein does the author declare that this is the primary meaning or sense of the word "education," neither does he say that this is all there is to it. In fact, his article makes it clear that he does not exclude the thought of training, much less does he deny that it is derived from the Latin *educō, educare, educavi, educatum*, as set forth in the criticism. And granting that the primary meaning was "to teach," "to instruct," "to train up," "to foster," etc., it does not follow that this Latin word is not etymologically one with *e-duco, educere, educum*, which means to lead forth, to draw out. As Dr. C. B. Hulbert, ex-president of Middlebury College, declares, "This makes the distinctive idea in education to be education. It implies the existence in man of latent germs, properties, capacities—call them by what term you please—which in a process of disciplinary training need to be developed." When the author of the second article adds, "to impart information," he misses the better meaning somewhat, for it is not the imparting, but the *informing* process, that makes the desired change in the mind. Education in its better sense is not what is done on the *outside* and *for* us, but what is done on the *inside* and *by* us. And, as Dr. Hulbert again says, "the distinctive idea of an education is not to increase what a man knows, but to *augment what a man is*." A teacher who imparts rather than draws out—imparts facts instead of developing inlaid powers—is a dismal failure. Neither is the one who retains the most the best educated, necessarily. "Feeding and nurturing" is not so much educating as the growing of the inlaid, God-given powers of mind. Parents make a mistake who try to induce a child to enter a profession which is antagonized by the inlaid bent of mind. According to the *Century Dictionary*, to educate meant to bring up a

child physically as well as mentally, and while *educere* was usually used with reference to bodily nurture and *educare* more frequently referred to the mind, these distinctions were not strictly observed, so that there is no authority for the statement that the *primary* sense of educate is to "draw out or unfold the powers of the *mind*," but of the *body* as well. Both articles are right as far as they go and do not conflict. The criticism was uncalled for. Education comprehends all this and more—God does much not mentioned.

B. F. EBERHART.

Orleans, Neb.

"SAINT PAUL ON THE SPIRITUAL BODY."—A REJOINDER.

In the *Methodist Review* for January-February is a critique on an article bearing the above caption and published in the "Arena" of the *Review* for May, 1903. The article is not annihilated by the critic, but may be strengthened by a reply to his criticism. Does the critic intend to affirm that spiritual is not diametrically opposed to material, or that they are alike? If so, his argument requires that he should give some instance proving their similarity, or some particulars in which they are the same. This he has not done unless in the sentence "'Soma,' body, is clearly stated by Paul to be 'a feature or attribute' of both." A fair parallel to this statement is this one: Light and darkness are alike, for they are both concepts of the mind, or describe the conditions of a locality. To my mind the statement is a begging of the question at issue. The only definition found in the *Standard Dictionary* which can fairly be applied to a body is this: "Spiritual—Of or pertaining to spirit, as distinguished from matter; . . . incorporeal, opposed to physical." Spirit is defined, "The form of being or substance characterized by self-consciousness, self-activity, and personality, and by the absence of the properties that distinctively belong to matter, as extension, inertia," etc. Now, if this is to be accepted as authoritative we shall look in vain for a more complete distinction or difference, in the width of the universe. Our critic affirms further: "Nor is it important to determine in this connection whether it is certain or uncertain, since Paul is not writing of the 'natural' or the 'spiritual' abstractly, but of the 'natural body' and the 'spiritual body,' and gives no authority for saying that 'they hold no feature or attribute in common.'" Now, this would reduce Paul's statement, "There is a spiritual body," to a string of words without meaning. If an adjective is used legitimately the attribute described by it is by its use declared to belong to the noun in relation to which the adjective is used. For example, in the phrase, "a white dove," the dove is affirmed to possess the attribute which the adjective "white" describes. Now as fully as the dove is declared to be white, so the affirmation of Paul, "There is a spiritual body," declares the body of which Paul is speaking to be spiritual, or entirely destitute of matter, or any attribute which belongs to matter. To say less is to affirm that Paul did not realize what his words meant, or did not know the truth regarding that of which he was speaking.

One of the statements of the critic, logically interpreted, to my con-

ception concedes the exclusion from the resurrection body of all matter: "A 'spiritual body' may be understood to be a body organized suitably to the necessities . . . in or on the scene or sphere of being in which it may exist." Well, now, the resurrection body is to be "with Christ" and the angels "in glory." Surely in such a "sphere of being" it would be reasonable to conclude it to have no need of matter, but to be like the other inhabitants of that "sphere," spiritual. "Are they not *all* . . . spirits?" Our critic seems practically, if not formally, to affirm that the resurrected body of Christ was material, and needed food, or at least that he ate for purposes other than identification. Perhaps it would be perfectly legitimate, if not indeed conclusive, to state that, the critic having the floor and the affirmative, we would wait for the exhibition of his proof. But it may safely be affirmed that, on the contrary, no evidence can be adduced from the Gospel narratives that Christ either manifested any of the attributes of matter, or ate save for the purposes of identification during his post-resurrection appearances. His single occasion of eating, or the instances wherein his body appeared to consist of matter, are fully paralleled by the behavior of the angels (whom we know to be pure spirit) during their visitations to the saints of old; while, on the other hand, it is altogether inexplicable, if his body was material, why his disciples met him but ten times, and at such times for merely a brief interview, and why they were not comforted by his continued presence during the forty days. The entire duration of all ten appearances may be fairly presumed to be less than twenty hours out of the nine hundred and sixty hours of the forty days: ten minutes each for the interview with Mary, the women, Peter, James, and Paul; two hours each for those on the Emmaus journey, each of the two evening appearances in the upper room and the journey to Bethany and the ascension; six hours each for the gathering at the Sea of Galilee, and that of the "five hundred brethren"—in all eighteen hours and fifty minutes. Again: Had Christ entered the door in the manner our critic suggests, there would have been neither ground nor reason for the fear of the disciples that a ghost was in their presence; for ghosts do not knock to obtain entrance, neither are they admitted by doorkeepers. Lastly: Would our critic affirm that the spiritual body named by Paul and defined by the article would meet with a cooler welcome in the day of resurrection, from the "soul as well as spirit" of the disembodied saint, than the material body which he so hazily defines? If not, what is the purpose of this digression?

HENRY G. BILBIE.

Owatonna, Minn.

MINISTERIAL SWEARING.

Is there such a thing as ministerial swearing? It does seem that some phrases and words, such as, "*In God's name*, let us," etc., and "I want to say that such things are *damnable*," need to be condemned not only as rude but as actually sinful. And it is truly disgusting to hear the "(hic)-er-(hic)-old-fellow-(hic)" of the drunken man imitated.

Morris Heights, New York City.

EDWIN H. CARL.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

PAUL'S ADVICE TO TITUS—TITUS II, 11-15.

THE practical advice which Paul has thus far given to Titus, outlining the things which he should communicate to the different classes of people to whom he was called to minister and urging them to abstain from that which is evil, is followed immediately by a reason. This is shown in the eleventh verse, which reads, "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men." This is the Revised Version. The margin, however, puts it more in harmony with the previous context, "hath appeared to all men, bringing salvation." This marginal reading seems to be a justification of the breadth of the counsel which the apostle has urged upon Titus. He has referred to them by classes, and to each class has offered special counsel. What more fitting, then, than that the apostle should say that "the grace of God hath appeared to all men, bringing salvation," that is, there is no exception; all classes, slaves included, are the subjects of the grace of God? Verses 11 to 14 express with great brevity and force some of the fundamental truths of Christianity. It is interesting to notice that even in the most practical advices of the apostle Paul he introduces the central teaching of his theological system as though there was a close relation between the doctrine and the practice which he enjoins. It is his constant teaching, on the foundations of which all true ethical life must rest. A study of these verses will bring out this more fully.

The grace of God is the source from which the great stream of blessings for mankind flows. The word "grace" is a standard word in the New Testament and a central word in Christian theology. Salvation by grace is the watchword of Christianity. Paul frequently uses "grace" and "peace" together, showing how closely the one is related to the other. We find this in his doxology (2 Cor. xiii, 14), "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all," and also in his salutations. *Saved by grace* is the constant phrase with which the Christian expresses his thankfulness for his salvation. Hence, the use of the word "grace" for the expression of a gracious act. In 2 Cor. viii, 19, a collection for the poor churches in Jerusalem is called a grace. It means kindness, favor, a gracious condition, a contribution. It is a broad word, but in the passage before us applies to the favor which comes to the world through Jesus Christ. "For the grace of God hath appeared" refers to the incarnation of the Son of God undoubtedly, but also refers to every manifestation of Christ when he has appeared to bless the world. The churches ever recognized this epiphany of the Son of God as the central point whence grace for the world emanates.

Further, we are informed that the grace of God is an educational

force in the world, "teaching us." This word, which in the King James Version is rendered "teaching" and in the Revised Version "instructing," may also be fitly rendered "educating" us. The grace of God which brings salvation is represented as an education for the world. This grace of God has been most effective in the training of humanity. The very fact that God has been gracious to all the world is itself an uplifting fact. Then, too, the incarnation of the Son of God has been a great educational factor in the world. It has exhibited to men the greatness of the divine love, God condescending to visit the earth in the person of his own Son. Then grace is itself a discipline. All gracious acts have been educating factors. That grace may be exercised toward others there must be a discipline of our nature: a self-denial of the thing which we often desire. This discipline comes through the means of grace, prayer, the sacraments, and the training in the Scriptures, all of which are God's gracious gifts.

We may further note the blessed results of God's grace in the personal life. This grace of God so works on the heart that a person in whom it manifests itself refuses to indulge in those things which are opposed to God's grace: "denying ungodliness and worldly lust." The word "ungodliness" may well be rendered "impiety," a failure to worship God, and this ungodliness is expressed by the apostle elsewhere as "without God in the world." Those whom grace has educated recognize God as their Father, and the Father of all men. But they refuse worldly lusts, that is, things that are of the earth earthy. Worldly lusts often are mental as well as physical. They are things of the mind and the soul. They are elsewhere described as the "lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." The one on whom the grace of God has come has been educated to refuse these things. This involves mental choice. God's grace in the heart leads to a choice; negatively, to refuse; positively, to live. They are exhorted here to "live soberly, righteously, and godly." Bishop Ellicott makes the remark: "The Christian duty under three aspects, to ourselves, to others, and to God."

"We should live soberly." This is that which relates to one's inner life. It is to live wisely according to proper judgment of things, a looking at everything in its proper light. To live righteously is the relation to which one stands to other lives, and to God. All these represent the kind of lives which the grace of God brings into the world. It is further said of the effects of this grace that this righteous living is in the present world. It does not indicate that we are not to live for the next world. This is shown in the following verse, but we are to see to it that our desire is to live righteously in the age of which we form a part. We have a similar passage in Gal. 1, 4, "And our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of the present evil world, according to the will of our God and Father." The present age is characterized as an age of evil in which Christians are sent forth as lights in the world and the kind of living they represent is urged in contrast to the regular living of the world. This passage is peculiarly appropriate to the age in which we live, an age of pleasure, too often an age of ungodliness, and an age of carelessness as well. All these things are corrected

when mankind are educated by the grace of God which brings salvation to all men.

This living which the apostle urges upon Titus is stimulated by the blessed vision which is ever opening before his view and which is found in the thirteenth verse: "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." It is the chief characteristic of our Christianity that it is a religion of hope. This word "hope" is a favorite word with the apostle Paul. It appears about thirty-five times in his epistles, not always with the same reference. Sometimes it expresses a hope to be enjoyed in the soul, sometimes an objective manifestation of the hope such as we find in this text, namely, "the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (King James Version). This passage has been an embarrassment to the translators. The revision of 1881 translates it, "looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." As a marginal reading we have "of the glory of the great God and our Saviour." Another form of rendering is, "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Spence, in his Commentary, remarks: "In this sublime passage the glory of the only begotten Son alone finds mention. Taken thus it is a clear declaration of the divinity of the Eternal Son, who is here styled our great God and Saviour." Reasoning merely on grammatical principles either translation would be possible, only even then there is a presumption in favor of the translation we have adopted. But other considerations are by no means so nearly equally balanced. The word manifest (epiphany), the central thought of the counsel, is employed by St. Paul in his epistles five times, in every one of them to describe the Christ and in four of them to designate the future manifestations of his coming in glory, as here. The term epiphany is never applied to the Father. Theodoret says, "St. Paul calls Christ the great God, and thus rebukes the heretical blasphemy which denies his Godhead." Chrysostom remarks: "What can those persons say who allege that the Son is inferior to the Father?" Thus the blessed hope to which St. Paul looks forward is ever in his mind; the hope of that glory which comes to men through Christ.

This passage further presents to us another of the great fundamentals of our Christianity, namely, the redemption through the atonement of Jesus Christ, "who gave himself for us." Here is a Pauline doctrine in Pauline language. The statement that he gave himself is similar to Gal. 1, 3, where the whole passage is strikingly similar to this. It is part of the apostle's salutation to the Galatian people, "Grace to you and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins." Here is the doctrine of redemption; the deliverance of men by a ransom, the purpose of which was "to deliver men from all iniquity and to purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works." Deliverance and purification through Christ are fundamental elements of the apostle's teaching. They are set forth so frequently and so clearly that any discussion of Pauline theology that should omit them from consideration would be at once recognized as a misrepresentation

of the teachings of the apostle. They seem to fall from his lips as commonplaces of his system without which he could not conceive of Christianity.

Lest there should be fearfulness on the part of Titus to communicate these truths to the perverse people whom he is appointed to serve, Paul closes this part of his admonition with a strong exhortation: "These things speak and exhort and reprove with all authority." It is well to note that this admonition is in the present tense. Titus is not to rest content with one sermon or with one exhortation, but he is to persevere until he accomplishes the purpose for which he speaks. "These things," he says, "speak" and bring them to their remembrance. Paul urges him with all the intensity of his nature. He adds a final word on the subject, "with all authority." This word may be rendered "with all commandment." He was not to speak hesitatingly or doubtfully; he was not to apologize for the utterances which he was to make, but to speak by way of command. He was an authoritative preacher, and should speak with the authority of one sent of God.

His final admonition in this part of his letter is, "Let no man despise thee." It is supposed that this passage means that his voice should be positive. It indicates that he should have a character which must be respected and a message to which people must listen. It is the setting forth of his message as a minister of the Church of Christ—the assurance of his right to speak—and it implies that it is the duty of the people to hear. But there is another meaning which may naturally grow out of this passage. In this view Titus is exhorted to conduct himself so that no man can despise him. There are some ministers that cannot be despised. They may be disliked, but never despised. This is not merely because they speak with a voice of authority, but because the life which they exhibit before men makes their utterances authoritative. It is the duty of the minister to live so closely with God, to be so thoroughly in love with his people and the truths which he is called to speak, and so useful in his life among men, that they cannot fail to respect him. Such ministers are everywhere respected, even by those who do not sit under their ministry or heed their voice. This closing verse of the second chapter of this epistle is very suggestive to ministers of the Gospel. They are reminded of the great fundamental principle of Christianity, namely, the grace of God. As was said in the opening of this paper, "grace" is one of the great words of the New Testament. It is one of the great central points of Christianity. Without it the Church is destitute of power, with it she is able to bestow manifold blessings upon the world. The apostle does not hesitate to combine practical exhortation with fundamental Christian truth in his exhortation to Titus, whom he had appointed as the pastor of the church in Crete.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

DELITZSCH AND HIS CRITICS.

OUR readers are familiar with the origin of the Babel and Bible controversy, which, though on the wane, has not yet spent its force. St. James's apothegm: "Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!" was never better illustrated than in this discussion. Delitzsch's first brochure contained only thirty pages, his second, one less, and both together, not more than thirty thousand words, or about sixty such pages as this. He is out with another pamphlet of seventy-five pages, entitled *Babel und Bibel, Ein Rueckblick und Ausblick* (Retrospect and Prospect).

The first two brochures were unmercifully attacked by critics of all schools and shades of opinion—Christians and Jews, Protestants and Catholics, orthodox and liberal theologians, and several expert Assyriologists. It seems that everybody had something to say. We knew this apart from the new brochure, from which we learn that the learned Assyriologist, having completed his duties for the summer semester at the university, and having placed his own museum in order, retired for rest (?) to the British Museum, so rich in Assyriological treasures and cuneiform inscriptions. Before leaving Berlin he selected from a wilderness of criticism which had been sent him no less than 28 pamphlets, 300 long articles, and about 1,350 shorter ones, most of which were adverse to his pamphlets. The criticisms which he regarded as of no value, as well as those written in foreign languages, were left in Berlin. He further adds—what he told the writer last July—that criticisms still pour in incessantly, and that literally from every part of the globe, "from Calcutta to the remotest farm on the California prairies, and from Norway to Cape Town. They come from all classes, high and low; many of them from women, and most all of them anonymous and unfriendly in tone."

The popularity of the booklets is well known. Edition after edition has been published, not only in German, but also in English, Danish, Swedish, Hungarian, Italian, and Czech. We can readily believe the professor when he says that nothing is more distasteful to him than publicity, and that the charge of "nothing new" is not unwelcome, though an injured air pervades the entire new pamphlet. Those who know Professor Delitzsch know him only to love him. He is fully as amiable as his late beloved father, so well known to a large number of our older American theologians. He stands in the front rank of Assyriologists, and may properly be called their corypheus. He is a charming man, most unassuming and approachable, and never happier than when surrounded by a few pupils, desirous of delving into the mysteries of archæology.

Notwithstanding the great success of his pamphlets, nobody is satisfied. Delitzsch chafes under the imputation that they lack originality. He says with some feeling: "My Christian and Jewish friends monotonous-

ly assure me, till I am exhausted with their repetitions, that my booklets contain nothing new, nor even present the old in an especially intellectual [*geistvoll*] form. Then, why all this stir, if, as theologians, professors, and pastors, and cuneiform experts in the bargain, aver, my lectures contain absolutely nothing new?"

Delitzsch is not convinced of the justice of this charge. He instances, in proof, the following: the Sargur documents, with their teachings regarding paradise and sheol—not known till 1901; the *Jave-ilum* or *Ja'um-ilum* tablets, known only to experts, and not published by the British Museum till 1898 and 1899, and the parallels between the codes of Moses and Hammurabi, which cannot be called old, since his second lecture was delivered in January, 1903, and the code of Hammurabi was not given to the public till October, 1902.

But why this stir, demands Delitzsch, if nothing new has been said? The real answer is that both lectures were delivered before the emperor. Now, his majesty had always been regarded not only as very religious, but also as quite conservative in his theological beliefs. The fact that Delitzsch was invited to deliver a second lecture in the castle was interpreted by many as a proof that Wilhelm II had been converted to the professor's views. Nothing was farther from the truth, for the emperor has since defined his position in most unequivocal language. Harnack puts the whole matter in a nutshell thus: "The opinion was likely to become widespread, had indeed become widespread, that the emperor occupied the same theological standpoint as Professor Delitzsch. Not wishing to permit this misunderstanding, the emperor wrote as the public read." The fact that the emperor was present at the two lectures, and that Delitzsch was asked to repeat them at the palace, added to the fact that his majesty wrote as he did to Admiral Hollman on the subject, explains to a great extent the great sensation produced, though Delitzsch does not seem to accept this view of the case. He attributes the extensive circulation and discussion of his booklets to entirely other causes, namely, the great chasm between the professional theologian and the layman in the Church. The latter, he claims, has been kept in ignorance of the great advances in biblical criticism and recent archaeological discoveries. The public schools, the pulpit, and the theological professors are responsible for this gap, which should be bridged over at any cost. The indifference of the teacher and clergy to these modern views he attributes, in the words of Harnack, to "indolence and fear of disturbing existing conditions." The truth must be boldly proclaimed, since "It is the truth, the unvelled truth, the whole truth, that makes us free." Cornill, representing the theologians, protests, saying that German scholars have no esoteric doctrines, but that their views are publicly proclaimed from their chairs, and all have the privilege of procuring their books. If the public does not avail itself, the scholars must not be held responsible. He naïvely adds, there are matters in theological "science concerning which discretion is the lesser evil." Delitzsch resents the imputation of Gunkel—that he has been actuated by a desire for *sensation*. Gunkel published, September 3, 1903, in *Der Rundschau*, a Berlin daily, a sharp animadversion, entitled

"Funeral Oration over Babel and Bible," in which occur the following words: "May our science [theology] be spared from such another sensation for centuries." Such a remark is at least ungracious.

He also protests against the charge of superficiality, explaining that the pamphlets were first delivered as lectures before an audience, made up, it is true, of cultured people, yet chiefly of nonspecialists, embracing every shade of religious belief. Besides, his time was limited, and the subject "had to be treated so as to interest and charm, and not to bore or lull his audience to sleep."

Another charge against Delitzsch is that he overstepped the boundaries of his profession. This point was, we believe, first made by the emperor. Our readers will remember that on Delitzsch's second visit to the palace he became entangled in some religious or theological discussion with the empress, who is ultra-orthodox, and with Dr. Dryander, the court preacher, also very conservative. The emperor was there too, but, strange to say, he simply "listened and remained passive." Delitzsch, to use the emperor's own words, "unfortunately abandoned the standpoints of the strict historian and Assyriologist, going into religious and theological conclusions which were quite nebulous and bold." The emperor characterizes his attack upon some of the Christian doctrines as "a deed for which the study of Assyriology did not justify him." This sentiment is shared by the theologians and Assyriologists alike, for one of the latter, Dr. Bezold, says: "In questions pertaining to revelation, Assyriology has no voice whatever."

*Delitzsch admits that he might have given the mere facts without any comment, but says that would have been cowardly, for had he not, on taking his degree (Ph.D., the only title he has, and this he never parades), solemnly sworn that "he would voluntarily represent the cause of truth and defend the same bravely as long as he lived"? He believed what he said and therefore had to say it. He further believes that he is qualified for such discussion and possesses sufficient knowledge of the Old Testament to be entitled to an independent judgment. He reminds his critics that he has studied the Bible from his youth, that he devoted six years to the religions of India, that from his twenty-second year, then, under the guidance of some of the most celebrated Old Testament scholars, he has incessantly continued his investigations in the religio-historical, extending them to the Koran and to the Babylonian-Assyrian cuneiform literatures. It is folly therefore to charge one who has done all this with ignorance of which no intelligent theological student at the close of his first semester at a German university should be guilty. We are inclined to think that Delitzsch has the right in this *ne sutor ultra crepidam* argument.

The charge against which Delitzsch protests most strongly is that wherein he is accused of teaching that Israel's monotheism is derived from Babylonian sources. He accuses König of great unfairness in reiterating this charge, in later editions of *Babel und Bibel*. He is still more severe on Gunkel. He finds it passing strange that his colleague could have published a "really false statement," namely, that "he [Delitzsch] had proclaimed Babylonian monotheism in a loud voice." Then he pays

his respects, without deigning to name him, to one of his old pupils, our Professor Hilprecht, thus: "It is deplorable that even Assyriologists who understand all the circumstances should imitate such jugglery, and that *one of these* should declare in different German cities that Israel did not derive its monotheistic conception from that immense graveyard, Babylon; worse still, when another declares that there is not a trace of monotheism to be found in Babylon."

He cites several passages from his lectures or *brochures* to show that he is not guilty of saying that Israel derived its monotheism from the Babylonians. Let the reader decide whether he makes a case:

"And now may I be allowed a final word regarding that which invests the Bible with a general historical significance—its monotheism?"—*Babel und Bibel*, I, p. 44.

"The religion of the Canaanitic tribes who had immigrated into Babylonia soon disappeared before the polytheism of many centuries, which had been practiced by the ancient inhabitants."—P. 47.

"In spite of all this, polytheism, crass polytheism, remained for three thousand years the state religion of Babylonia."—P. 49.

"I have never ceased to emphasize the crass polytheism of the Babylonians, and feel under no obligation to palliate it."—II, p. 32.

The term "ancient inhabitants" is a little ambiguous, and we should call attention to the fact that it is often applied to the allophylian, or primitive, pre-Semitic inhabitants of Babylonia, often called Sumerians. These dwelt in the fertile plains of the Euphrates and Tigris, and very naturally their territory was invaded by outsiders from less fertile countries. There was a constant going and coming, war followed conquest and conquest war. These invaders, without doubt, brought in many new ideas, religious and otherwise. This explains the second reference above to "the religion of the Canaanites," who invaded Babylon about 2500 B. C. Then came the Cassites about 2000, and the Chaldeans about 1000 B. C.

It was from these regions that Abraham went to Canaan. He must have carried some Babylonian ideas with him. This does not say that Israel derived its monotheism from the Babylonians as a people, but simply that the progenitors of Israel were acquainted with Babylonian customs, language, and religion. This fact is further shown by the study of many proper names of the period, especially those compounded with *Jave* or *El*. Delitzsch promises a discussion of the name Moses, which he conjectures to be of Babylonian origin and not Egyptian, as has been commonly supposed. Now, if Abraham came from southern Babylonia, it is not wonderful that the supreme being was known there under the name Jave.

Delitzsch emphasizes the high state of morals in Babylonia, in some regards higher than those of the Israelites; at any rate, not any less humane, nor more cruel, as has been generally supposed. He also takes pleasure in explaining that the theophanies of the Hebrew Scriptures are not to be taken literally any more than those of the cuneiform texts. Indeed, most of the former are paralleled in the latter. Both are symbolical and not historical. Thus the angelic visions and the giving of the law on Sinai are not to be believed as historical facts, but religious symbols.

This, he adds, is the more probable, since now many of the leading Protestant clergy teach that even the ascension of Christ has no historical basis, but is symbolical only.

Now, what are Delitzsch's views of inspiration or revelation? Lest we may misrepresent him, we shall answer this question in his own words. He says: "I hold the view that in the Old Testament we have to deal with a development effected or permitted by God, like any other product of this world, but, for the rest, of a purely human and historical character, in which God has not intervened through a special supernatural revelation." He says again: "The modification of the original conception of revelation, deeply rooted in ancient orientalism, by a surrender of the verbal inspiration, made by both evangelical and Catholic theology, and even by the Church, irretrievably divests the Old Testament of its character as the 'Word of God.'" He believes in a revelation, of gradual growth and historical development. He comes out flat-footed against some of the modern critics, who seem to straddle the fence; he says that the term "divine revelation," as held by the Church, and historical or human development are irreconcilable contradictions." One or the other must be accepted. *Tertium non datur*. Then again, speaking of the Torah, or Law of Moses, he says: "The divine character of the Torah will have to be excluded from scientific discussion."

The only doctrine of revelation to which Delitzsch will subscribe is a general one, common to all men and times, where God speaks to the head and conscience of men, as he does in nature and history. Alexander the Great, for instance, appears with special clearness as the instrument of such a divine agency (*Walten*). God's fatherly love embraces all mankind, he speaks to all nations alike. He quotes Gunkel with approval, who says, "Far be it from us to limit revelation to Israel," and then as a parting shot taunts "the theologian" with the glaring contradiction, for saying in the same pamphlet, "Israel is and will remain the people of revelation." He then sarcastically adds, "Only theologians by profession should speak on the subject of revelation."

In conclusion, we must thank Professor Delitzsch for his third pamphlet, not that it contains a single new idea, but for its freshness and frankness. His language is generally perspicuous and unambiguous, especially when he speaks of inspiration and revelation. The Old Testament is no more inspired than other religious books. Indeed, the songs of Arndt are worthier of a place in our religious education "or to be carried by our boys every day to school," than are the war songs of the Old Testament. It would be a good thing for some of our American modern critics, who are sadly "on the fence," if they also could speak with more clearness and less ambiguity on the question of inspiration and the nature of revelation.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

Bernhard Weiss. It is interesting to find a man so old engaged in literary work with as much zest as he had in youth. But such is apparently the case with Weiss. During 1903 he not only published the seventh edition of his *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, but also an entirely new work on *The Religion of the New Testament (Die Religion des Neuen Testaments)*. Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, Nachf.). This book differs from the same author's *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* in that it attempts to set forth, not the various types of Christian thought of the different individuals whose writings we have in the New Testament, but to show that those types are capable of being proved unitary. Not only are they not contradictory, they are not even divergent in such a sense as to suggest different growths from the same root. They are parts of a whole, in accord with each other, and all of them necessary to the whole. The multiplicity of ideas in the New Testament can be reduced to a unity—this is with Weiss axiomatic. The New Testament can be understood only when considered in the light of Christ as the revelation of a manifested salvation. The religious life of the New Testament kindles a similar life in the reader of the New Testament, and the personal experience thus arising is the proof of the unity of the New Testament through which that life flows. Under such circumstances it would be impossible that the various parts of the New Testament should contradict each other. If any New Testament document contradicted or hindered the development of the effect of the whole that document could not be a part of the revelation and would have to be excluded from the canon. The only elements constitutive of the New Testament not directly contributing to the whole unitary effect are a few ideas which are not fully assimilated to Christianity. The motive of Weiss in attempting to harmonize the details of New Testament teaching into a unit is that thereby the place of the cross in the Christian system is more clearly brought out. To Weiss the message of Jesus was the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. But taking the New Testament as a whole, not this teaching of Jesus, but the death of Jesus, is the fact that is emphasized; and it was the fact of the death that overcame the world, while the world overcame Christ as the teacher of his great truths. Such are the guiding principles in Weiss's conception of the religion of the New Testament. We must confess it does not seem to us that Weiss has succeeded very well. The attempt to harmonize all the different ideas of the New Testament depends upon arbitrary methods of reconciliation as truly as the old-fashioned harmonies of the four gospels did, and it is therefore as unsatisfactory. As to the argument from personal experience to the effect that since the New Testament as a whole produces that experience the New Testament must therefore be unitary, it overlooks the fact that it is not

the details which produce the experience, but the unitary fundamental principle running through the whole. If Weiss had spent his strength in showing that there are certain great principles constitutive of the religion of the New Testament, and that they are each and all direct or implicit teachings of Jesus, he could have made out a good case. It is not necessary to the unity of the Christian religion that the conception of it held or emphasized by all the New Testament writers should be identical. Such a unity would not necessarily reach deeper than to mere externals. A unity in principle is entirely consistent with many divergences of individual application. And it is just the glory of the religion of the New Testament that it admits of such varied application. It seems to us also that Weiss erred grievously in making the message of Jesus one thing and the message of the apostles another. By so doing he destroyed the unity of the New Testament religion, and mutilated the teachings of Christ, who certainly did include in his message the fact and significance of his approaching death.

Alfred Seeberg. In a recent work on *The Catechism of Primitive Christianity (Der Katechismus Urchristenheit, Leipzig, 1903, A. Delchert, Nachf.)* Seeberg has attempted to turn all the "modern" critical conceptions of the origin of doctrinal and ethical formulas topsy-turvy. His claim is, in brief, that within a very few years after the crucifixion of Jesus there was extant among the Christians a well-formulated system of doctrine and of ethics, that this formed the substance of the teaching of all the apostles, and that this was accompanied by a practically uniform method of administering baptism and the Lord's Supper. This kind of theory is a severe blow to those who hold that practically everything we regard as peculiarly ecclesiastical is the product of an age considerably later than the apostles. Seeberg certainly has found coincidences between some expressions and teachings of Paul and such later documents as "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which are, to say the least, striking. The "ways" of the "Teaching of the Twelve" have, Seeberg thinks, their origin in the "ways" Paul refers to in 1 Cor. iv, 17, where Paul's "ways" are not to be understood as his ways of doing things, but as the ways of life described by him. That such an ethical norm existed and was known to the Roman Christians from the first existence of the church in Rome is clear, thinks Seeberg, from Rom. vi, 17, where the "form of teaching" must, according to the context, have referred to questions of conduct rather than of opinion. According to Seeberg, therefore, when Paul speaks of his "ways" he uses the term "ways" as a technical designation of a tolerably well-fixed series of utterances on moral themes—a warning against certain sins and a recommendation of certain virtues. And he thinks that Matt. xv, 19, and Mark vii, 21, give us hints that there was essentially such a teaching among the Jews and that it was known and adopted by Jesus. So much for his opinion concerning the fixed ethical formulas of the earliest apostolic age. As to the doctrinal formula Seeberg is equally certain. He thinks Paul makes clear use of it in 1 Cor.

xv, 3-5, as also in Rom. vi, 1-7, and Col. ii, 11-13. But he thinks that Paul did not use the whole of this doctrinal formula in 1 Cor. xv, 3-5, but that he omitted there both the opening and the closing portions of it. The opening words of the formula must, according to Gal. iv, 4, and Rom. viii, 3, have declared that the living God, the Creator of the world, sent his Son, Jesus Christ (2 Cor. i, 19), who was of the seed of David (Rom. i, 3). The formula must have concluded, according to Rom. viii, 34; Col. iii, 1, and Eph. i, 20, with the reminder that Jesus Christ now sits at the right hand of God; that the evil spirits are subject to him (Eph. i, 21; Col. ii, 10-15), and that he will come to judge the world (Rom. ii, 16; 1 Thess. i, 10). This same formula, with slight modification, Seeberg sees in 1 Pet. iii, 18-22; iv, 5; and in 1 Tim. vi, 13, f., and 2 Tim. ii, 8; iv, 1. He thinks also that it was the basis of the speeches in the Acts, chapters ii, iii, v, x, xiii, and of the words of Jesus as reported in Luke xxiv, 44-47. Further, it is referred to in Heb. iii, 1; iv, 14; x, 23. What, now, shall we think of these extraordinary ideas? In the first place, it must be said that it is truly refreshing to find one who undertakes to determine what was apostolic and what post-apostolic by a study of the New Testament. This the great majority have not done; but have simply assumed that post-apostolic in time meant post-apostolic in thought; and that, as a consequence, if any ways of looking at things were found in post-apostolic literature they were not in existence during apostolic times. A careful study of Paul's "ways" as referred to above lends color to Seeberg's theory concerning an early ethical formula; and that there were doctrinal formulas in apostolic times Seeberg has once more made clear. But there is no sufficient reason to think that the ethical and doctrinal teachings of the earliest apostles or of Paul were in fixed form as early as Seeberg thinks they were. The great outlines of later ethics and doctrine were held from the first; their development into fixed formulas was the work of a later age.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Was Jesus Ekstatischer? Eine Untersuchung zum Leben Jesu (Was Jesus an Ecstatic? A Study in the Life of Jesus). By Oscar Holtzmann, Tübingen, 1903, J. C. B. Mohr. Before any estimate can be made of the worth or worthlessness of this book it will be necessary to ascertain the sense in which the author uses the word ecstatic. Unfortunately he employs the term in such a variety of meanings which are so diverse and unconnected that it is difficult to determine just what he does mean. Among other things that he says of the ecstatic are the following: The ecstatic is the instrument or medium of a spirit foreign to himself, and acts when impelled by this spirit. Manifestations of ecstasy are seen in acts of an unaccountable, sudden, or passionate kind. The ecstatic speaks what is dictated or designated by the spirit, and his speech is as unaccountable and unexpected as his deeds. Holtzmann adds to these accounts of the ways of the ecstatic certain definitions that tend to confuse us, though in some ways they give dignity to ecstasy. For example, ecstasy is sometimes identified with enthusiasm (apparently in a good sense),

sometimes with fanaticism, sometimes with excitement, sometimes with revelation, or inspiration. Everything in the thought or deed of anyone is ecstatic which lies far beyond the circle of the ordinary human, or which transcends the common way of looking at things. Holtzmann is sure that Jesus was at times an ecstatic; and he thinks that the recognition of this makes our thought of Jesus clearer and more vivid. He thinks that John the Baptist was also an ecstatic, and that in this respect Jesus was a follower of John. Without this ecstasy Jesus never could have come to think of himself as the Messiah. This ecstatic state began with his baptism, and the Spirit which controlled him was the Spirit of God. From that time on Jesus knew that he was under the influence of a Spirit hitherto foreign to him. These preliminaries being settled, Holtzmann proceeds to decide which of the words and acts of Jesus were or were not ecstatic. Among the speeches of Jesus those in Luke x, 18-24, and Matt. xii, 28, and xix, 28, are ecstatic; while the eschatological speech of Jesus in Mark xiii is not ecstatic. This belief in the immediate end of the world, and that he himself was destined by God to be the Lord of the future, was ecstatic, and out of this belief flowed the idea that the kingdom of God was not wholly in the future, but was actually effective then and there. The eight woes of Matt. xxiii were in some degree ecstatic. The ecstatic in Jesus sometimes manifested itself in his miracles, as, for example, in the cursing of the barren fig tree and the stilling of the storm, but not in the multiplication of the loaves and fishes. Jesus's prophecy of his suffering and death betray ecstasy, without which the worth of his self-denial could not have been recognized by him. The word of Jesus concerning his burial in connection with the anointing at Bethany was not, but his words and actions in connection with the Last Supper were ecstatic. According to Holtzmann there were instances in which Jesus was a vigorous opponent of the ecstatic state, and his book contains a lengthy section on the nonecstatic activities of Jesus. This is a strange book. Its chief value is, perhaps, in the fact that it gives us a new grouping of the words and deeds of Jesus, and thus helps us to see them apart from the traditional connections. The book is also an honest attempt to recognize the influence of the Spirit of God in the work of Jesus—the Holy Spirit is the foreign Spirit which, sometimes at least, wrought through Jesus. But just here is also the weakness of the book. It assumes that the Spirit of God is essentially foreign to Jesus, whereas the assumption of the New Testament writers is that the Spirit of God is, so to speak, native to him. Holtzmann's attempt to classify the words and deeds of Jesus as ecstatic and nonecstatic will appear to most readers as arbitrary and unsuccessful.

Jesus, was er uns heute ist (What Jesus is to the Man of To-day).

By Alfred König, Freiburg i. B., 1903, P. Waetzel. This book is an attempt to show what Christ, apart from any elaborate doctrine concerning his person, is, religiously, to the modern world. The book is in two principal parts, the first treating of the rejection of Christ by the modern man, the second of the grounds upon which Christians affirm his worth

for our time. In the first part König takes up several types of rejecters of Jesus. First, the materialist and practical atheist, who, while not a new phenomenon, represents a tendency quite strong in modern times. König makes the strong point as against materialism when reduced to practice, that it is just the dark background against which the facts of Christ's life shine out with the greater beauty; so that practical materialism is compelled against its own will to give its testimony in favor of Jesus. As a second type of those who reject Jesus König names the man of the modern view of the world, who is not only not a materialist but perchance an idealist—the man who finds in the teachings of Jesus presuppositions which conflict with modern ideas. To such a man König points out that a distinction must be made between the essential teachings of Jesus, which have permanent worth, and those features of his teaching which had but temporary significance, but which were necessary to the impartation to the then world of the divine truth. As a third type he considers at length the cultivated man of the world, to whom the somewhat austere requirements of Jesus are offensive. He makes the point that the teachings of Christ do not pretend to give a direct answer to every question that can be asked, but that Jesus did set up the true goal and ideal of morality, toward which we must strive as individuals and as a social whole. The approaching end of the world in which Jesus believed influenced his teaching and that of his disciples in their ethical views. But the spirit which pervades Christian thought is more powerful than any particular form in which Christian thinking betrays itself in any age, and this spirit is the corrective of all that is temporary or transient in Christian history. This all-pervading spirit teaches not the forsaking of the world, but the overcoming of the world, its subjugation to the ethical ends of life. Thus the teachings of Christ appear of permanent value to all earnest men, and a source of inspiration to earnest endeavor to others. As a fourth type he names the man who is struggling for existence, to whom Jesus offers himself as a Saviour and true Helper in the struggles of life. In the second part of the book König points out that Jesus is to-day, as ever, our helper in attaining to a true relation to God. He does this not alone by teaching that religion is a filial relation to God, but by living out and embodying all the virtues of that relation. Furthermore, he helps us to a true relationship to ourselves and to the material world in teaching, as he does in Matt. xvi, 26, that our life is worth more than all that this world has to offer. Third, he helps us to a true relationship to the world of mankind by making his religion the saving power for social renewal and health. König believes that the harmony between the Gospel of Jesus and the human soul is such that it is as necessary to all men to-day as ever it was. König believes that the real significance of the life of Jesus was that he strove to make the sons of men one with God the Father as he was one with him. And in this also consists the abiding significance of his personality, that it works to-day as ever in the same direction. The book reminds one of Harnack's *What is Christianity?* Both books may be recommended as likely to do their readers good.

GLIMPSES OF REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

With wide variety and ample scope fourteen distinguished contributors from Europe and America write in the December-March number of the *International Quarterly* (Burlington, Vermont) on such subjects as "The Paris Commune of 1871," "Early Teutonic Society," "The Consciousness of Animals," "Modern Orchestral Conductors," "Alexander the Great and Universal Monarchy," "Porfirio Diaz: Soldier and Statesman," "Trade Agreements," "The Economic Value of Advertising," "Japan and the United States." Rollo Ogden, writing of "Political Satire," says: "Too strong a satirical bent is as fatal to a public man as is a reputation for levity. The late Thomas B. Reed had great political ambitions, as well as great powers. But his native talent for satire often ran away with him. He answered fools according to their folly. He flung out biting epigrams. He lashed and girded right and left with his sharp tongue. Thus he made resentful enemies of men who might have been his admiring supporters. He giped at President McKinley as "the Emperor of Expediency," and hurled at the expansionists after the Spanish War the epigram that he already had more country than he could really love. But he did not rise to the height of great events in a crisis. He was not the man to front a great emergency, or to go to his countrymen with words of weighty remonstrance and passionate appeal. In Speaker Reed the satirist killed the statesman. He could set off squibs, and made a reputation as a man of smart sayings but not of large, serious, and lofty utterance." Some allege that Edward R. Ames made too free and frequent use of his native gift of satire, and that his cutting sarcasms, sometimes mercilessly flung out, detracted from his usefulness, his influence, and his dignity as a bishop. As to the justice of that allegation we record here no opinion, but remark in general that the man who can wantonly or recklessly wound his brother's feelings is not fit to be trusted with power over his brethren. And sarcasm is a weapon the use of which is seldom justifiable. Professor W. M. Payne writes nobly of the present position, opportunities, and responsibilities of the American scholar. He says that "all the encroachments of materialism upon American life cannot conceal the fact that this nation was founded upon idealism, political, ethical, and religious, and that America still believes in the sunlit peaks, however they may be obscured by the sullen vapors of these lower slopes on which much of our life gropes to-day." He gives great credit to Emerson for keeping idealism alive and making it victorious, and being a helper of all who would live in the spirit. Referring to the war against slavery, he quotes John Morley's saying that "Emerson's teaching was one of the forces which nourished the heroism of the North in its immortal battle." Emphasizing the need of intellectual honesty, he quotes Carlyle's familiar prayer: "May the Lord deliver us from all cant. May the Lord, whatever else

he do or forbear, teach us to look facts honestly in the face, and to beware (with a kind of shudder) of smearing them all over with our despicable and damnable palaver, into unrecognizability, and so falsifying the Lord's own gospels to his unhappy blockheads of children, all struggling down to Gehenna and the everlasting swine's-trough for want of gospels." Professor Payne points out that the great inspirers and leaders of mankind have been men who had that fortitude of soul which is based on an assured faith in the future, on an unwavering confidence in the ultimate triumph of right over wrong and of light over darkness; a faith not so much in a particular creed or body of defined doctrine, but in the validity of every fine, noble, altruistic impulse, every generous motion of the spirit; a faith in the perfectibility of mankind, which can turn from the disheartening spectacle of man as he now is to the vision of man as he is to be when he escapes from "the passions of the primal clan" and the eons "touch him into shape:"

All about him shadow still, but, while the races flower and fade,
Prophet-eyes may catch a glory slowly gaining on the shade,
Till the peoples all are one, and all their voices blend in choric
Hallelujah to the Maker, "It is finished. Man is made!"

It is faith of this fervent and invincible sort, at bottom a faith in God, which sustains the leaders and helpers of men in the darkest hours of human history. Such was Mazzini's sublime faith in the future of his dear Italy, uttered most eloquently at a time when Italian liberty seemed well-nigh extinct, and when to prophecy its rebirth was like preaching the resurrection to an unbelieving generation. Such was James Darmesteter's faith in a better future for France, eloquently spoken at a time when she was following blind guides along strange paths of defeat and disaster. This faith in a nobler future for mankind fills the familiar passage from Condorcet's *Progrès de l'Esprit Humain*. "How this picture of the human race freed from all its fetters, withdrawn from the empire of chance, as from that of the enemies of progress, and walking with firm and assured step in the way of truth, of virtue, and happiness, presents to the philosopher a sight that consoles him for the errors, the crimes, the injustice, with which the earth is yet stained, and of which he is not seldom the victim! It is in the contemplation of this picture that he receives the reward of his efforts for the progress of reason, for the defense of liberty. He ventures to link them with the eternal chain of the destinies of man. It is there that he finds the true recompense of virtue, the pleasure of having done a lasting good. Fate can no longer undo it by any disastrous compensation that shall restore prejudice and bondage. This contemplation is for him a refuge, into which the recollection of his persecutors can never follow him; in which, living in thought with man reinstated in the rights and the dignity of his nature, he forgets man tormented and corrupted by greed, by base fear, by envy; it is here that he truly abides with his fellows, in an elysium that his reason has known how to create for itself, and that his love for humanity adorns with all purest delights." Especially Professor Payne insists that

It is the highest duty of the American scholar in our new century to uphold, not merely faith in humanity and in progress, but also the special faith that to our own nation has been given the mission to lead the world toward a true conception of the fellowship of man, that the new world has, indeed, been divinely appointed "to redress the balance of the old." That democracy must in the end prevail in the societies of human beings who are worthy to be called men, was held to be truth unquestionable by the Fathers of the Republic, and whatever strength has hitherto nerved us in the great crises of our national life has been born of that belief—our splendid heritage from those who have gone before us and whose example we are fain to emulate. In our own day, that belief has found no lack of advocates, and among them we hold in most grateful remembrance that fine flower of American scholarship and American manhood whose Birmingham address on "Democracy" offers the most persuasive and convincing modern exposition of our political gospel. James Russell Lowell seems, indeed, to have been the ideal American scholar of Emerson's prophecy. Singularly receptive to the benign ministries of nature, he was also at home in the world of books, yet he never allowed books to usurp for him the claims of life. And when the pressure of events called upon him to act, he stepped buoyantly into the arena, and bore his share of the brunt of the conflict. He held, moreover, that the duties of scholarship were paramount to its privileges, and shirked no task that was set him to perform, cast aside no burden that was laid upon his shoulders. And to all his life-activity he brought the moral fervor that had come down to him from the generations of his Puritan ancestry, and nursed the fire of his indignation until it became a devouring flame upon all those who sought selfish aims at the expense of the commonwealth. Indicating the measure of the American scholar's duty to his country there is quoted the inscription which occurs in a painting of the last judgment which adorns the great hall of the Ducal Palace in Venice: "Those are to be accounted wise who, by their own, avert their country's perils, for they render to the republic the honor which is its due, and would rather perish for, than with, many. For it is desperately wicked that we should treasure for ourselves the life which nature bestowed for our country's service; to surrender it at nature's demand, but refuse it when our country asks it. Wise, too, must they be accounted who shun no danger in their country's service. This is the price we are bound to pay for the dignity we enjoy in the republic, this the foundation of our liberty, this the wellspring of justice." In such stately terms was wisdom defined by the little island republic of the Adriatic; our own continental republic, its shores washed by two oceans, will hardly be able to better that instruction, or improve upon that ideal of devotion to the commonwealth. In an article on "Modern Orchestral Conductors" is related an incident somewhat interesting to any minister who has had a conflict with his choir as to whose authority is supreme in arranging the order of service. Theodore Thomas was conducting the performance of an oratorio, the soprano part of which was taken by Adelina Patti. At the rehearsal a dispute arose regarding the pace at which a certain air should be taken. Madame Patti claimed

that her opinion ought to prevail, because she was the prima donna; whereupon Mr. Thomas retorted, "I beg your pardon, Madame, but here I am prima donna." This confused the genders but ended the dispute. In the same article we are told of the masterly power of Liszt as conductor of an orchestra in filling his players and singers with the spirit of the composition they were interpreting. Anton Seidl thus described him: "His Jovian countenance filled everybody with a sort of holy awe; his colaborers were lifted to the top of a lofty pedestal; all were profoundly, majestically moved, inspired, and made conscious of a high mission. Liszt radiated an exalted magic on singers as well as instrumentalists. . . . He compelled all to love and believe in the composition he brought forward." A similar power may radiate from the inspired preacher, the enkindled enthusiast, in the pulpit, compelling men to love and believe in the divine message he brings them.

Among the art publications of the Macmillan Company are *The Artist Engraver*, a quarterly magazine of original work for persons who are interested in engraving on copper, steel, or wood, in lithographs, or in etchings; and *The Burlington Magazine* (New York and London) issued monthly at twelve dollars a year for connoisseurs in all branches of the Fine Arts, edited by C. J. Holmes and Robert Dell with the advice of a consultation committee of forty eminent art experts, European and American. The March number which closed the fourth volume contained fourteen articles, including one by Cyril Davenport, F.S.A., on "Embroidered Bindings of Bibles in the Possession of the British and Foreign Bible Society;" the articles being explanatory of, or illustrated by, more than thirty finely executed plates. This one issue deals with pottery, tapestries, mosaics, jewels, porcelains, embroideries, paintings, woodcuts, armor, inlaid pavements, vases, colored glass, ancient weapons, carved furniture, bronzes, shrines, candelabra, and terra-cotta ornaments. This expensive magazine is manifestly not for ordinary taste or purses; but is one of the refined luxuries of wealth and æsthetic culture. What it aims to do for the development, culture, and sensitizing of the sense-faculties, it is our business to do with still greater effort, devotion, enthusiasm, delicacy, and power for the nobler spirit-faculties which apprehend Realities that do not perish or pass away. Among the articles the one most nearly adjacent to the interests and sympathies of our readers is that on "Three Pictures in Tempera by William Blake." The pictures which are reproduced, full-page, have biblical subjects, *The Flight into Egypt*, *David and Bath-sheba*, and *The Nativity*. William Blake, the poetic genius, author of the *Book of Thel*, *Songs of Innocence*, *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, *The First Book of Urizen*, *Europe*, and *Songs of Experience*, was also an artist who left numerous woodcuts, wash-drawings, engravings, and some elaborately finished pictures of which the three here reproduced are samples. Considering Blake's position as a painter Roger E. Fry writes: "A singular, an inexplicable phenomenon was the intrusion, as though by direct intervention of

Providence, of this essentially Assyrian spirit into the rapidly polite circles of eighteenth-century London. Puritanism had for a century and a half blocked every inlet and outlet of poetic feeling and imaginative expression save one; and it was the devotion of Puritan England to the Bible, to the Old Testament especially, that fed the spirit of William Blake directly from the inspired sources of the most primeval, the vastest, and the most abstract imagery which mankind possess. Brooding on the vague and tremendous images of Hebrew and Chaldean poetry, he arrived at such indifference to the actual material world, at such a vivid perception of the elemental forces which sway the spirit with immortal hopes and infinite terrors that what was given to his internal vision became incomparably more definite, more precisely and clearly articulated, than anything presented to his senses. The forms he uses are the visible counterparts to such words as *the deep, the firmament, many waters, the foundation of the earth, the pit, the host*, and others like them, whose resonant overtones blur and enrich the sense of the Old Testament. Blake's art moves us by a similar evocation of vast elemental realities and forces. The obsession of his nature by great spiritual ideas and *sensations*, if one may so use that word, was complete; he was entirely without curiosity about such trivial and ephemeral things as the earth produced. His temperament was anti-Hellenic; he had no concern, either gay or serious, with sense phenomena: they were too flimsy and transparent to arrest his eye. His great difficulty was that the appropriate forms for conveying his highly spiritual ideas were not supplied by the art resources of his day. Tintoretto, who had a similar temperament and felt a similar need of conveying directly the revelations of his internal vision, was more fortunate, inasmuch as, although he was by comparison a trivial and vulgar seer, he was able to achieve a more effective expression by using the richly expressive forms which lay ready to his hand in the art of Titian and Michelangelo. . . . Blake declared that the Byzantine style of art-expression was directly revealed to him, and he certainly did succeed in recovering for a moment that pristine directness and grandeur of expression which puts him beside the great Byzantine designers as a fit interpreter of Hebrew tradition and literature. The Byzantine artists were masters of the expression of imaginative truths; and Blake was an eloquent and persuasive master of the language of symbolic form by which the spirit communicates its most secret and subtle impulses. He boldly made the plea for art that it is a language for conveying impassioned thought and feeling which takes up the objects of sense only as a means to this end, owing them no allegiance and accepting from them only the service they can render for this purpose. He says, 'Poetry consists in bold, daring, and masterly conceptions; and shall painting be confined to the sordid drudgery of realistic facsimile representations of merely mortal and perishing substances, and not be, as poetry and music are, elevated into its own proper sphere of imagination, invention, and visionary conception?' Into the figures of *The Flight into Egypt* Blake puts a supernatural dignity, hieratic solemnity, and superhuman purposefulness. The Virgin sits on the ass as though enthroned in monumental state, her limbs

fixed in the rigid symmetry which oriental art has used to express complete withdrawal from the world of sense. And the same exalted mood is upon the figures of Joseph and the guiding angel. William Blake gave visible form to profound spiritual conceptions and emotions, and lent to Hebrew and Christian history and tradition a new significance and elevation."

The Forum (New York) for April-June contains articles on politics, finance, foreign affairs, applied science, music, and education. A paper of special interest is on "Literature: Popular Criticism," by Herbert W. Horwill, one of the editors of *The Forum* and an occasional contributor to the *Methodist Review*. From A. C. Benson's biography of Alfred Tennyson Mr. Horwill quotes the following illuminating comment on the complication and obscurity of "The Princess:" "It is strange that the charge of obscurity so frequently launched against Robert Browning has never been hinted against Tennyson; and yet I declare that the speeches, both in 'The Princess' and the 'Idylls,' are some of the most obscure reading that it is possible to discover in modern poetry—a strong desire for compression, for ornateness, for coagulating a clause into an epithet, for epigrammatic and proverbial touches, making the language like a labyrinth of sonorous walls, even when the thought to be expressed is neither abstruse nor complicated." Benson agrees with Fitz Gerald that the quality of Tennyson's writings declined when he became popular, that he was drawn aside from his natural path by social influences, the pressure of public expectation, and the desire to modify and direct public thought. The gist of the criticism is in this paragraph: "I suspect that he was overshadowed by a fictitious conscience; he was human, though a very large and simple character; and the atmosphere in which he lived was unreal and enervating. If he had not been a man of overpowering genius and childlike simplicity, the effect upon him would have been disastrous. He would have become pontifical, self-conscious, elaborate. As it was, his position only acted upon him with an uneasy pressure to write and think in ways that were not entirely consonant with the best (? bent) of his genius." "Maud" is instanced as showing the beginning of this decadence—as marking "the period at which the purely poetical impulse began to flag, and required to be roused by a violent situation, a tragic interest." Mr. Benson doubts if the bard is in his proper place, when pacing up and down the platform and indulging in strident tirades against the general moral slothfulness of the world. The biographer of Bret Harte says that Harte never could make himself a writer of distinction because "his style lacks firmness and consistency, much as his life lacked these qualities; it lacks refinement, precisely as his nature lacked refinement. With all his particularity in the choice of words he could only use them as counters. He had no sense of language as an organism, and his diction is consequently often conventional, inflated, or coarse." Ferris Greenslet says of Walter Pater's writings that "while one may fail to agree with this or that opinion, or may tire of the subtle, intensive style, he who will approach

him sympathetically may sweeten the day by the reading, and be sure of taking from his pages a lively sense of the fullness and color of the world, and a fresh impulse to a gracefully ordered, thoughtful life." In the same number of *The Forum* Grant Allen gives some personal reminiscences of Herbert Spencer. Spencer used to say that you cannot find a better gauge of a man's intelligence than to observe the proportion which personalities bear to generalities in his conversation. Spencer rarely spoke of any person except for some practical purpose, or else to illustrate some general principle. He generalized incessantly. If you remarked it was a fine day, he would answer: "Yes, anticyclonic conditions like those of yesterday seldom break up without warning of the advent of a depression from westward." If you observed that Mrs. Jones is a pretty woman, Spencer would reply: "Her father was a West Highlander, and her mother was Irish; and intermarriage between Highlanders and Irish almost always produces physically handsome but intellectually inferior children." Once at Marian Evans's house, the talk turned on fly-fishing, and she asked Spencer what sort of fly he preferred to fish with. "Oh," said he, "I lay little stress on the particular kind of fly; I make my own; and all I aim at is to give what the fish expects—the vague representation of an insect fluttering about over the surface of the water." "I see," said Marian Evans (so he always called her), "You're so fond of generalizing that you fish with a generalization." Grant Allen who was no exacting moralist, admits serious moral defects in Spencer's character as well as serious errors and lapses in his intellect. Herbert Spencer's father was a Wesleyan Methodist. But young Spencer was a rebel in many ways; he *wouldn't* go to school, he *wouldn't* study languages. He finally consented to learn mathematics and sciences, and later civil engineering. Grant Allen says unfairly, as we think, that "the faculty for linguistics is most developed in the lowest order of minds, being most common in children and in the inferior races." Early in life Spencer gave himself up to the work of systematizing the evolutionary idea. He determined to become a monk of study, a poor friar of philosophy. A lifelong bachelor he shut himself up to this work, living frugally on the small patrimony left by his father, until that was exhausted and he was so destitute that friends like Stuart Mill and E. L. Youmans felt constrained to offer financial aid. He lived in a boarding house and did all his work in a bare little room over a milk-shop. Grant Allen admits that Spencer was so dogmatic in his conclusions and assertions that he was irritated when others opposed their convictions to his and that he sometimes fell upon opponents with bulldog ferocity. Allen thinks Herbert Spencer "*knew* he had the largest brain of his time, he *knew* posterity would put him above Aristotle, Bacon, Newton, and Kant,—though he never said so." Did Spencer really *know* this? How could he or anybody else know it? Is this the sort of certainty men of science mean when they say "*I know*"? A homely sage has said that it is better not to *know* so much than to be cocksure of so many things that *are not so*. If Grant Allen is right as to Herbert Spencer's estimate of himself, what a modest gentleman the author of *The Synthetic Philosophy* was! But is not consciousness the universally revered authority to-day?

And if a man is *conscious* of being the greatest man alive, who can dispute it? Is not that the end of all controversy? As to Herbert Spencer's appearance Mr. Allen says: "A tall thin man, very springy of step, whose looks were at first distinctly disappointing. Some men look their greatness the moment you see them—for example, George Meredith. Spencer did not. At a cursory glance you might think him the confidential clerk of some old business house. His face though disappointing was serene and placid. The lower half was poor and ill-developed. If you screened the lower part so as to see only the forehead and eyes, you would say, What a glorious head! But if you screened the upper part and saw only the chin and mouth, you would say, What a feebly endowed emotional nature! The one great charm in Spencer was a clear and silvery voice, surpassed only by Edmund Gosse's and Sarah Bernhardt's. His enunciation had a beautiful distinctness. In later life when pessimism soured him, the silvery tone was lost in querulousness. Once when somebody beat him at a game of skill in which he thought himself an expert, he declined to play any more and withdrew saying solemnly: 'Some acquaintance with games of skill becomes a cultivated mind, but mastery such as yours bespeaks a wasted youth. I wish you good morning!'"

THE first number of the *Baptist Review and Expositor* (Louisville, Kentucky) is before us. It is edited by the faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, with President E. Y. Mullins as editor-in-chief. The editors "believe there is both need and opportunity for a Baptist quarterly in North America. They are not unaware of the disappointing results of similar efforts in the past, nor insensible to the perils which lurk along the way of all such publications. They think there is need of such a review in their Church, because many minds are in need of guidance and help. The *Review and Expositor* accepts evangelical Christianity as commonly held by the Baptists of to-day. Its sympathies are with truth from any and all sources. To 'prove all things' and to 'hold fast that which is good' will be its aim. All important contributions will be signed by the writers. The editors are responsible only for their own views. It will be neither possible nor desirable to maintain a rigid doctrinal uniformity. Neither Northern, Southern, nor Canadian Baptists are wholly agreed among themselves on all doctrinal matters. It is inevitable, therefore, that considerable diversity of opinion will appear." The April issue contains eight solid articles on such topics as "Symbolism in the New Testament," "The Virgin Birth," "An Analysis of the Sermon on the Mount," "The Twentieth Century Sunday School," "The Code of Hammurabi," and "Is God's Moral Government Out of Order?" A notice of Professor W. N. Rice's *Christian Faith in an Age of Science* says that he has done good service in showing that Christian faith can live side by side with scientific convictions. We welcome this latest-born to the family of Reviews, and hope for it a large circulation in its denomination.

BOOK NOTICES.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

The Teaching of Jesus. By Rev. GEORGE JACKSON, B.A. Crown 8vo, pp. 252. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Undenially worth reading by the men of to-day are the writings of George Jackson, author of *The Table-talk of Jesus*, *A Young Man's Religion*, and *The Old Methodism and the New*. He dedicates this latest volume to his children, whom he calls "My wisest teachers in the things of God." These Sunday evening discourses delivered to mixed congregations are proof that "a man may preach freely on the great themes of the Gospel and yet be sure that the common people will hear him gladly, if only he will state his message at once seriously and simply, and with the glow that comes of personal conviction." Mr. Jackson acknowledges his indebtedness to Professor George B. Stevens's *Theology of the New Testament*, commended here by us some time ago, and calls it "a work of which it is impossible to speak too highly." He also mentions gratefully Selby's *Ministry of the Lord Jesus*, Robertson's *Our Lord's Teaching*, and Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*. Speaking from the British point of view, he says: "Now that Dr. Dale has gone from us, there is no one to whom we may more confidently look for a reasonable evangelical theology which can be both verified and preached, than Dr. James Denney, of Glasgow," whose great book, *The Death of Christ*, published by our Book Concern, we recently noticed. The author wisely says that however a minister may follow in his studies the critical discussions of debatable questions, when he has passed from his study into his pulpit his sole business is with the *Certainties*, of which there are enough to occupy a lifetime of preaching. Harnack is here spoken of as "a critic who is ready to give to the winds with both hands many things which are as dear to us as life itself." Touching the attempt of some to show opposition between the teaching of Paul and the teaching of Jesus, we have the following: "The doctrines of Paul are not so much theological baggage of which the Church would do well straightway to disencumber itself. After all that the young science of Biblical Theology has done to reveal the manifold variety of New Testament doctrine, the book still remains a unity, and the effort to play off one part of it against another—the Gospels against the Epistles or the Epistles against the Gospels—is to be sternly resented and resisted. To Paul himself any such rivalry would have been impossible and unthinkable. There was no claim which he made with more passionate vehemence than that the message he delivered was not his but Christ's. 'As touching the gospel which was preached by me,' he says, 'neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ.' 'We have the mind of Christ,' said Paul, and both in the Epistles and the Gospels we may seek

and find the teaching of Jesus. The words of Paul and his brother apostles are, in a very true sense, 'the final testimony of Jesus to himself.' It is pointed out that one reason for the stability and irremovableness of Christ's teachings is their winnowedness, their freedom from any chaff which the winds of time and change can drive away. The keen mind of George J. Romanes noticed that while Plato was the greatest of human thinkers in the direction of spirituality, yet the Greek seer teaches errors which are absurd to the reason and shocking to the moral sense. His words cannot stand. Vastly different are the words of Christ; there is in literal truth no reason why any one of his words should ever become obsolete. He has no doctrines which the subsequent growth of human knowledge—whether in natural science, ethics, political economy, or elsewhere—has had to discount or modify. This fact seemed to Romanes one of the strongest evidences for Christianity. Mr. Jackson's sixteen chapters set forth the teaching of Jesus concerning God, concerning Himself, concerning His own Death, concerning the Holy Spirit, the Kingdom of God, Man, Sin, Righteousness, Prayer, the Forgiveness of Injuries, Care, Money, the Second Advent, the Judgment, and the Future Life. Speaking of Christ's word concerning himself, "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many," our preacher says: "There is in Edinburgh a Unitarian church on the front of which is carved these words of Paul, 'There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.' Why did not the Unitarians finish the quotation? Paul only put a comma where they have put a full stop. The next words are, 'Who gave himself a ransom for all.' But could he do that if he was *only* 'the man Christ Jesus'? 'No man can save his brother's soul, nor pay his brother's debt.' And Christ's life could be no ransom for our forfeited lives if he were only one like unto ourselves. The only explanation that can explain what Christ taught concerning himself is the one given by his first disciples and reechoed by every succeeding generation of Christians: 'Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ; Thou art the Everlasting Son of the Father.'" Similar to the Edinburgh Unitarians' misuse of an incomplete quotation in support of heretical doctrine is a quotation on the front of "All Souls' Universalist Church" in Brooklyn, New York. The passer-by looks up and reads on the stone these words of the Lord, "ALL SOULS ARE MINE" (EZEK. XVIII, 4). There is no need to ask why the All Souls' Universalists did not go on to quote also the troublesome words which the Bible puts so uncomfortably near in the last clause of that very same fourth verse: "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die.*" From Dora Greenwell the author quotes part of a pitman's story of how, when he was in his sins, this word of fire got into his heart and would not let him be: "The Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

It was for me that Jesus died! for me and a world of men
 Just as sinful and just as slow to give back His love again;
 And He didn't wait till I came to Him, but He loved me at my worst;
 He needn't ever have died for me if I could have loved Him first.
 And could'st Thou love such a man as me, my Saviour? Then I'll take
 More heed to this wandering soul of mine, if it's only for Thy sake.

From Thomas Hardy's most powerful story this is quoted: "Did you say the stars were worlds, Tess?" "Yes." "All like ours?" "I don't know; but I think so. They sometimes seem to me like the apples on our tree. Most of them splendid and sound—a few blighted." "Which do we live on—a splendid one or a blighted one?" "On a blighted one." The passing of Dr. William MacLure in Ian Maclaren's touching idyl is also reprinted here. "A'm gettin' drowsy; read a bit tae me," said the doctor to Drumsheugh. Then Drumsheugh put on his spectacles, and searched for some comfortable Scripture. Presently he began to read: "In my Father's house are many mansions;" but MacLure stopped him. "It's a bonnie word," he said, "but it's no for the like o' me. It's ower guld; I daurna tak' it." Then he bid Drumsheugh shut the Book and let it open of itself at the place where he had been reading every night. Drumsheugh did as he was bidden and the book opened at where the Master tells what God thinks of a Pharisee and a penitent sinner. And he read, and when he came to the words, "And the publican, standing afar off, would not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me, a sinner," once more the dying man stopped him: "That micht hae been written for me, Paltrick, or ony ither auld sinner that hes feenished his life, an' hes naething tae say for himsel'." Nothing to say for ourselves—that is what it comes to, when we see and know the truth about ourselves. "Not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to His mercy He saved us." Commenting on the words, "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation," Mr. Jackson quotes from Charles Kingsley's *Yeast* these words of Colonel Bracebridge: "I am no saint, and God only knows how much less of one I may become; but mark my words—if you are ever tempted by passion and vanity and fine ladies to form liaisons, as the jezebels call them, snares, and nets and labyrinths of blind ditches to keep you down through life, stumbling and groveling, hating yourself and hating the chain that binds you—in that hour of temptation pray—pray as if the devil had you by the throat—cry to Almighty God to help you out of that cursed slough! There is nothing else for it. Pray, I tell you; pray!" Those are words for every young man, in the ministry or out of it, to lay to heart. And in every crisis hour of need, distress, danger, what else can a man do but, as Browning says, catch at God's skirts and pray?

Advent and Ascension; or, How Jesus Came and How He Left Us. By D. W. FAUNCE, D.D., author of *A Young Man's Difficulties with His Bible, Prayer as a Theory and as a Fact, Shall We Believe in a Divine Providence?* etc. 12mo, pp. 215. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. Price, 75 cents.

Doing what we have never done before, we adopt as our own the notice given by another review to this volume issued by our own Book Concern. We adopt it because we approve it. The *Bibliotheca Sacra* says: This defense of the miraculous character of Christ's advent and ascension is one of the best which we have ever seen. But the subject is much more inclusive than it seems. It is practically a presentation of the whole supernatural element running through the life of our Lord, involving the entire range of distinctively Christian doctrines, Christ's work

depended upon the exaltation of his nature. His work was what no mere man could do. The blending of the supernatural with the natural is continuous from beginning to end of his career. That it is mysterious is beyond question. But mystery envelops all truth; and that of the blending of the natural with the supernatural in the life of Christ is no more a bar to our believing in it than is the union of the mental and the physical in our own constitution a bar to our believing that our personality involves the union of mind and matter. The author's statement of the relations of Christ's two natures to each other is peculiarly happy. After summarizing the impressions made upon the Virgin Mother, upon the general public, upon his own disciples, and upon successive generations of believers, and after considering the import of Christ's own statements concerning himself, the author condenses his views as follows: "Only four inferences are possible: If we shall say, looking on one class of facts, that he is only divine, there remains a large class of facts of which no account can be given. If we shall say, on the other hand, that he is only human, one equally large class of facts remains not included in the theory. If we shall say he was superhuman only, neither human nor divine, but in some way superior to man and inferior to God, then what becomes of both classes of facts, neither of which is accounted for in this hypothesis? These three theories of Christ's nature set aside, as not covering the facts, one more remains: that the Person whom we know as Jesus Christ was the God-man; the Son of God becoming the Son of man, 'God manifested in the flesh.' And this conclusion reconciles and combines both classes of texts—those which speak of him as God and those which speak of him as man. The question is not whether this is or is not explicable. We bow before it as the divine mystery. But we must not so hold the revealed fact as to make the divinity absorb the humanity, or the humanity the divinity, nor yet so as to claim a double consciousness in the one Person, our Lord Jesus Christ; nor need we hold to two natures separately existing side by side, now one acting and now the other. Yet the whole mode in which this incarnation was accomplished must always baffle us. Human reason has no plummet that can sound the depths of God. There were those who felt that the impassibility of God forbade any words about the divine nature as suffering. There were those who held that there could be no self-deprivation of the divine attributes, no self-renunciation of any divine perfection; not even a voluntary self-limitation. But all this was to limit God's power to limit himself, and so it actually affirmed in one direction what it denied in another. Whether it is necessary to call in the idea of self-limitation or not, some have questioned. The phrase frequently used about 'the limitations of humanity' as applied to our Lord needs to be employed with great caution. God self-limited—limited by himself in the exercise of his attributes—is a widely different conception from God limited by humanity—God limited by man. Indeed, what has been claimed as limitation in the case of Christ is really extension to the conditions of men. He was able to extend his being so as to become babe, child, man. He reached out and came into every variety of human experience. It may be considered as an expansion rather than a contraction, an enlargement rather than a reduction. It is the condescension of Divinity to care

for the lowliest. Infinite greatness is shown in the greatness of care for minutest objects. Jesus was able to die, showing thereby his power; God was seen in self-sacrifice at the cross; and these were not limitations but divine extensions toward our human needs" (pp. 128-130).

Primitive Semitic Religion To-day. A Record of Researches, Discoveries, and Studies in Syria, Palestine, and the Sinaitic Peninsula. By SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, Professor of Old Testament Literature and Interpretation, Chicago Theological Seminary. 8vo, pp. 288. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$2.50.

Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients, Forschungen und Funde aus Syrien und Palästina. Von SAMUEL IVES CURTISS. Deutsche Ausgabe, nebst einem Vorwort von WOLF WILHELM GRAFEN BAUDISSIN. Crown 8vo, pp. xxx and 378. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. Price, paper, M. 9; cloth, M. 10.

The works of American scholars rarely appear in German editions. German scholars read American books in reasonable measure, though not to the extent in which German books are read by us. But they do not seem to wish them translated into German, and in a recent instance they have sharply attacked an American scholar whose book is appearing in German. It may have required some courage for Professor Curtiss to put his book forth in Germany, but we are glad that he has done it. The form in which it appears is a compliment to the Germans, as the scientific leaders of the world, for the German edition greatly exceeds the English in size and contains a number of chapters which do not appear in the English edition at all. It is introduced by a preface written by the distinguished scholar, Professor Baudissin, of the University of Berlin, which is a perfect model of what such introductions should be, but rarely are. Professor Baudissin is not only an Old Testament scholar of the highest rank, he is also one of the first living authorities in comparative religion of the Semitic peoples. He praises Professor Curtiss's work, and praises it with dignity and generosity. He shows how Professor Curtiss has sought to explain, in part, the religion of Israel by the religion of the Semites who still inhabit the ancient territory of the Hebrews, and in this investigation has followed in a measure the example set years ago by the great German Arabist, J. G. Wetzstein. But while thus recognizing in the fullest degree the importance of the work and commending its methods and results, Professor Baudissin expresses his dissent on a few points and upon others emphasizes the need of caution. The frankness and the soberness of this introduction are characteristic of its author, and will raise the book in the estimation of scholars the world over. Professor Curtiss has written a book which plainly grew slowly and naturally, and is therefore totally different from the hastily conceived and quickly executed works with which the market is flooded. In the autumn of 1898 he made his first trip in Palestine, and perhaps few men are better prepared for the journey than he. He had then been Professor of Old Testament Literature and Interpretation in Chicago Theological Seminary for twenty years, and before that time had the incomparable enrichment of four years' study at the University of Leipzig under Professor Franz, who counted him a favorite pupil. His first tour in the East began July 9, 1898, and concluded August 17, 1899. The second extended from June 11, 1900, to August 23, 1900; the third began June 5, 1901, and ended August

24, 1901; while the fourth comprised the weeks between May 26 and the month of August, 1902. During these periods Professor Curtiss covered practically the whole of Syria and Palestine, visited Sinai and Petra, and made a long tour in Egypt. His object was to seek out every evidence of the primitive forms of Semitic worship which have survived to the present day. He found sacred stones, sacrificial altars, and many another evidence of ancient forms of worship. He questioned large numbers of persons, and from them secured illustrations of the present-day observance of religious rites and ceremonies, which presumably go back to primitive times. The investigation has been carried on with immense care, with every effort to eliminate possible errors, and is a model piece of entirely original research. It would be a pity to spoil the reader's interest by making extracts, and we forbear. Students of comparative religion will need no urging to read the book. To others it will be sufficient to say that the investigation pours a flood of light upon the Old Testament, that it is all couched in simple and attractive style and will well repay even the ordinary reader. All who can use German easily will find the German edition valuable, in addition to the English. Others may content themselves happily with the English.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Vocal and Literary Interpretation of the Bible. By S. S. CURRY, Ph.D. 12mo, pp. 384. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Dr. Curry has been teacher of Elocution and Oratory in Boston University, in Newton Theological Institution, in Yale and Harvard Divinity Schools. This volume contains the wisdom of many years of experience, and brings to the preacher sensible and valuable instruction, suggestion, warning, and encouragement. It is for serious study, not for entertainment. The author says his book has had no predecessor, and Professor F. G. Peabody agrees that both in its method and its spirit it is without precedent. Its purpose is to teach the minister to read the Scriptures in public so intelligently, impressively, and effectively as to convey the sense. Not only are principles given, but numerous specific passages of Scripture are here interpreted and rendered so as to illustrate the principles; and this we think to be the book's most definite value. Every minister who has any sense of responsibility for making his message and the word of God effective will welcome Dr. Curry's book with eagerness and study it with gratitude. No part of public worship is so often perfunctory, careless, and uninspiring as the preacher's reading of the Scripture lessons, although nothing else is more susceptible of being made vivid and powerful. A clergyman asked a humble member of his church what led to his conversion, and the answer was, "Why, sir, it was hearing the minister read one morning in church, 'As the Lord of hosts liveth, before whom I stand.'" "How did those words lead to your conversion?" said the clergyman. "Don't you see, sir? 'Before whom I stand:' *I felt myself standing before God.*" The Scripture lesson must have been feelingly and impressively read that morning. How to interpret, by his

reading of them, the various messages of the Bible with sympathy, yet without artificiality or extravagance, is surely one of the minister's most serious duties. The wonder is that, with our poor, careless, unintelligent reading of the word, men listen so patiently; and that, with our frequent misrepresentation of Christ, so many believe on him. The contents of this very helpful book are arranged in four divisions, "The Problem," "The Message," "The Technique," and "Preparation and the Service." Some wise suggestions are made concerning public prayer. "An elaborate prayer giving information to the Deity is irreverent, and a prayer containing the news of the week or a long catalogue of petitions for things which are not expected is blasphemous." As we said, many of the most striking passages of both the Old and New Testaments are here analyzed and explained, sentence by sentence, clause by clause, to show how they require to be read in order to their proper powerful effect. We wish we had room to transcribe the ten pages in which the author shows how the story of the Prodigal Son ought to be read, that parable so full of dramatic elements; or the Sermon on the Mount; or the story of Naaman; or Paul's great addresses; or others of the numerous passages so impressively rendered with vocal modulations and movements. All extremes and shades of feeling are in the words of Scripture. The words of Christ himself contain a wide range of differing emotions. What variations of expression in voice, tone, look, and gesture must have accompanied his varied utterances! What regret is in his words, "How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings"! What approval in "Go in peace"! What sorrow in "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem"! What sarcasm in "Go tell that fox"! What indignation in "Ye offspring of vipers"! What tender sympathy in "Woman, behold thy son"! What sorrow and pity in "The cock shall not crow before thou shalt deny me thrice"! What supreme confidence in "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me"! What persuasion in his "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden"! What admiration in "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel"! What infinite love and compassion in "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do"! To give, in our public reading, such variations of voice modulation as their meaning requires and as the Master doubtless gave them is a worthy object of ambition and endeavor. One of the important matters in reading is the placing of the emphasis. This may be seen in Matt. xxvii, 11: "Art thou the King of the Jews?" The word "thou" has a peculiar value in the meaning which must be indicated in the vocal accentuation. Canon Farrar gives the meaning thus: "There, amid those voluptuous splendors, Pilate, already interested, already feeling in this prisoner before him some nobleness which touched his Roman nature, asks him in pitying wonder, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?'—thou poor, worn, tear-stained outcast—thou pale, lonely, friendless, wasted man, in thy coarse peasant garments, with thy tied hands and the foul traces of the insults of thine enemies on thy face and on thy robes—thou, so unlike the fierce, magnificent, truculent Herod, whom this bloodthirsty multitude acknowledged as their sovereign—art *thou* the

King of the Jews?" Such a rendering of the meaning is exegesis, not rhetoric. Another important matter in reading is the intelligent use of pause, which properly managed may add vastly to the impressiveness. This is fully set forth and illustrated by specific Scripture passages in Dr. Curry's book. On page 322 we find this quotation from Delsarte: "Accentuate the fundamentals, and you will have power; accentuate accidentals, and you develop mediocrity and show weakness." The thing which strikes us in that saying is the wide range and many realms in which it is true. Delsarte applied the statement to the actions of the body, an application relatively unimportant. But how momentously true in most important things is the saying, "Accentuate fundamentals, and you both manifest and produce power; accentuate incidentals, and you both show and promote weakness"! It is as true in theology, in biblical study, in character, and in life as it is in public reading of the Scriptures. The strong wise man is he who knows what the fundamentals are and puts mighty stress on them; the weak foolish man is he who does not know the difference between the important and the unimportant, but spends himself equally on both and often makes a great ado and a fierce fight over the nonessential—an error out of which comes the blurring of distinctions, the undue prominence of little men and cranks, clamorous and strident about some detail, and a wide welter of confusion, wherefrom in Church and State we do often suffer. Delsarte's dictum is a text to carry in the vest pocket of one's memory, for frequent application. Dr. Curry's book raises all kinds of questions. Should the minister reading the Scripture lesson comment as he goes along? Spurgeon did nearly always, and Beecher sometimes. There are dangers in the practice. All depends on the audience, the occasion, the particular passage, and the man himself. Shall the minister make gestures in reading the Bible? Seldom, if ever. Dr. Curry's aim and spirit are revealed in such words as these: "This book aims to awaken higher ideals regarding the conducting of public worship. It endeavors to open all eyes to a neglected function, to an overlooked means of power, and especially to impress the importance of reading the Bible better. What is more needful than the true vocal interpretation of the Holy Scriptures? Nothing is so likely to strike home. The wildest and most reckless man in your congregation may have heard at his mother's knee the words you read. If rightly read they will fix his attention. They may awaken tender memories, renew spiritual aspirations, strengthen the weak and wavering will. Without debate, without arousing antagonism, the sublime words appeal straight to the intuitions of men's hearts, and make them feel themselves spoken to by the Eternal. What is the preacher's final appeal in struggling with a soul at some crisis? To some sentence from the Bible. When he faces a young man wavering at some turning point what does he give him? Some words of the Master. When he stands up at a funeral service and looks around on the broken-hearted, what can he do but read those divine words which have ministered to the sorrow-stricken for thousands of years? In the Bible are the most simple, heart-searching, touching, and potent words ever spoken. Their spell is mighty wherever they touch hu-

man nature. Well may a man tremble at the thought of presenting or misrepresenting the meaning of these words to his fellow-men. Who can dare deliver them coldly or carelessly?" A great biblicist has said, "The heretic is he who does not study his Bible, or does not study it reverently and thoroughly, with the best aids available." And surely that minister is a culprit who does not take studious and persevering pains to read the Scriptures impressively and movingly.

The Faith of Robert Louis Stevenson. By JOHN KELMAN, JR., M.A. 8vo, pp. 302. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Mr. Kelman is a notable and magnetic Edinburgh preacher who has especially a strong hold upon students and young people generally. More than any other man he succeeds to the place and the work of Professor Drummond. He finds in the writings of Louis Stevenson a faith which is precious to him and vitally helpful. The expression of this faith is largely in Stevenson's own words. The man is made to reveal himself. To many the amount of religious matter in Stevenson's writings for making a book like this is a surprise. It is not claimed that Stevenson was a saint; in some early years he was wild enough and often rudely and daringly irreligious; but it is shown that religion was an increasing force in him as the years advanced. He speaks of himself as having been "pestered with a damnable creed," against which he revolted in youth. He was one "whose God no house of words that men have builded can contain." His final conception is probably explicit in his address to the Samoan students: "The meaning of religion is a rule of life; it is an obligation to do well; if that rule, that obligation, is not seen, your thousand texts will be to you like the thousand lanterns to the blind man." When some Sisters of Charity arrive at Molokai to minister to the poor lepers, Stevenson greets them with, "Ladies, God himself is here to give you welcome." In Samoa he became a church attendant, a Sunday school teacher, an enthusiast for foreign missions and missionaries, a leader in family worship for which he wrote prayers that are memorable and almost classic. Mr. Kelman shows that religion always had a vital interest for Stevenson, even in the early years of revolt, and at last it took complete command of him. Always, God was the overshadowing fact; God, of whom Joubert said, "It is not hard to know him, provided we do not force ourselves to define him." In Stevenson's morning prayers were expressions like these: "Let not our beloved have cause to blush for us, nor we for them. Accept us, correct us, guide us, thy guilty innocents." Also: "Help us to look back on the long way that thou hast brought us, on the long days in which we have been served not according to our deserts but our desires; on the pit and the miry clay, the blackness of despair, the horror of misconduct, from which our feet have been plucked out. For our sins forgiven or prevented, for our shame unpublished, we bless and thank thee, O God!" Also: "Lord, defend me from idle conformity aimed to please the face of man, and from all display designed to catch applause." His mother tells us that when he was four years old he said, "You can never be good unless you pray;" and when asked how he knew,

he replied, with great emphasis, "Because I've tried it." Stevenson always kept the feeling and spirit of a child. From California he wrote in depressing illness: "But death is no bad friend. A few aches and gasps and we are done. Like the truant child, I am beginning to grow weary and timid in this big jostling city, and could run to my nurse, even though she had to whip me for my truancy before putting me to bed." Eight months before his death he wrote: "As I go on in life, day by day, I become more of a bewildered child; I cannot get used to this world." Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, which charmed Stevenson's childhood, lived in his mind forever, and he even gave thanks for the pictures illustrating it, which made him feel as if he knew "every turn and town along the road to the Celestial City, and that bright place itself, seen as to a stave of music, shining afar off upon the hilltop, the candle of the world." We read that, from Stevenson's point of view, Edinburgh was a place chiefly notable for "conscious rectitude, eminent respectability, and freezing formality," which description reminds us of some saints and churches. He writes of the "clockwork virtues" of a prim pattern woman, with her "irritating deliberation and correctness," and says, "If she would only write bad grammar, or forget to finish a sentence, or do something or other that looks fallible, it would be a relief." He criticises the average sermon because it "flees the point, disporting itself in that Eternity of which we know, and need to know, so little, and avoiding the bright, crowded, and momentous fields of actual life where destiny instantly awaits us." One of his phrases is "the commanding immediacy of life." He insists that there is "a manifest God for those who choose to look for him." And he says: "If you believe in God, where is there any more room for terror? If you are sure that God, in the long run, means kindness by you, you should be happy." Facing those conflicting aspects of Nature which sometimes darken our vision of the divine goodness, he says:

And methought that beauty and terror are only one, not two;
And the world has room for love, and death, and thunder, and dew;
And all the sinews of hell slumber in summer air;
And the face of God is a rock, but the face of the rock is fair.

One of Stevenson's favorite doctrines is that eternal dissatisfaction with one's self and one's attainments is the condition of progress. "The artist who says *It will do* is on the downward path." "To have many aspirations is to be spiritually rich." "To travel hopefully is better than to arrive, and the true success is to labor." "Happiness, temporal or eternal, is not the reward a man seeks. Happinesses are but his wayside campings; his soul is in the journey." "Our business in the world is not to succeed, but to continue to fall in good spirits; and when the end comes to be content with this epitaph, Here lies one who meant well, tried a little, and failed much; or, There goes another faithful failure." But Mr. Kellman properly remarks that such a doctrine is safe only for the strenuous: most of us are only too willing to accept it and consent to fail. Stevenson himself is one who *never consents to fail*, but ever gallantly struggles to achieve "the glory of going on." Near the end of life he wrote a friend:

"For fourteen years I have not had a day's real health. I have written in bed, written in hemorrhages, written torn by coughing, written when my head swam for weakness; and thus far it seems to me I have won. The battle still goes on—ill or well is a trifle, so as it goes. I was made for a contest, and the Powers have so willed that my battlefield should be this dingy inglorious one of the bed and the physic bottle." He welcomed "the harsh voice of duty" and "the bright face of danger." Duty was a lifelong summons. The call he heard was, "*Wanted, Volunteers to do their best for twoscore years!*" The Parable of the Talents was his favorite Scripture. He said: "The man who has only been pious and not useful will stand with a long face on that great day when Christ puts to him His questions." He holds that God delights in those who "sow gladness on the peopled lands, and spin the great wheel of earth about with laughter, song, and shout." Deploring duly the excesses of appetite and passion, he finds the truly diabolic rather in "envy, malice, the mean lie, the mean silence, the calumnious truth, the backbiter, the petty domestic tyrant, the peevish and selfish poisoner of family life." "It is our business," he said, "to make excuses for others, but none for ourselves." He hates "those who have an eye for faults and failures, taking pleasure in finding and publishing them, and who forget the overvelling virtues and the real success." He also says, "There is no more sure sign of a shallow mind than the habit of seeing always the humorous side of things." He resents Thoreau's mean saying that we are always disappointed in our friends, and contends that "We are ninety-nine times disappointed in our beggarly selves for once that we are disappointed in our friend." His is an appreciative soul, believing enthusiastically in man in general and in many individual men in particular; and, while in Samoa, especially in some missionaries. "The best specimen of the Christian hero I ever met was one of the native missionaries." "The excellent Clarke was here almost all day yesterday, a man I esteem and like to the soles of his boots; I prefer him to anyone in Samoa, and to most people in the world; a real good missionary." Of another missionary he says: "A hero, a man who fairly took me by storm, the most attractive, simple, brave, and interesting man in the whole Pacific." Of his friend, James Chalmers, the New Guinea missionary, he writes: "You can't weary me of that fellow; he is as big as a house and far bigger than any church." One of his convictions is that "the world must return to the word Duty, and be done with the word Reward. There are no rewards, but plenty of duties. And the sooner a man sees that and acts upon it like a gentleman, the better for him and for the world." He bids "never to set up to be soft, only to be square and hearty, and a man all round." He likes strong, healthy, high-strung, generous natures, honorable, simple, and righteous. After praying that we may clearly see and deeply feel our failures and offenses, he adds: "Help us at the same time, Lord, with the grace of courage, that we be not utterly cast down when we sit lamenting amid the ruins of our happiness or our integrity; touch us with fire from the altar, that we may be up and doing to rebuild our city." He tells the story of one who made shipwreck through folly, and who in the bitterness of loss and shame came to him-

self and began a nobler life. "In his youth he took thought for no one but himself, and he voyaged away; when he came ashore again, his whole armada lost, he seemed to think only of others. He had gone to ruin with a kind of kingly *abandon*, like one who condescended; but once ruined, with the lights all out, he fought as for a kingdom." Stevenson, suffering, battling, dying, wrote near the last, "Sick or well, I have had a splendid time of it; I grudge nothing, regret very little." Enduring ills which might make some men pessimists, he said: "In the harsh face of life faith can read a bracing gospel;" and again: "Whether on the first of January or the thirty-first of December, faith is a good word to end on." When he was fighting with death and losing he wrote Professor Colvin: "The tragedy of things works itself out blacker and blacker. Does it shake my cast-iron faith? I cannot say that it does. I believe in an ultimate decency of things; aye, and if I woke in hell, should still believe it." That is the faith of one who can

Feel, in the ink of the slough
And the sink of the mire,
Veins of glory and fire
Run through and transpire and transpire,
And a secret purpose of glory in every part,
And the answering glory of battle fill his heart.

Mr. Kelman believes that the first necessity of the present day is for an encouraging and heartening type of faith, lest we sink to that dejection in which an age "goes dispiritedly, glad to finish." And Louis Stevenson administers as antidote and prophylactic the spirit of buoyant and exhilarating hopefulness. This is the true *Zeitgeist*. Blind-deaf-dumb Helen Keller says of Stevenson, "I can never again be disheartened since that sturdy preacher gave me my lesson of 'the fashion of the smiling face.'"

The Diversions of a Book-Lover. By ADRIAN H. JOLINE. 8vo, pp. 323. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$3.

The author of *Meditations of an Autograph Collector* tells us that these discursive papers must not be regarded too seriously, but regarded as diversions to draw the mind from care, business, or study, and thus rest and amuse. They are the free and easy confidences of one who loves books for their own sake, and are meant to be taken up and laid aside at odd moments. It is a book which only a book-lover seeking light diversion will care much about—miscellaneous odds and ends. A Scotchman, revising the old lines, spoke of preachers who "find stones in the running brooks, sermons in books, and good in everything." John Burroughs said of Thoreau, "He is almost as local as a woodchuck." Milton wrote: "Many a man is a burden to the earth, but a good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." In *Lawyers and Literature* Irving Browne says: "To call a clergyman a hypocrite, a physician a murderer, and a lawyer a liar, has long been one of the favorite amusements of a part of mankind." Bret Harte, in one of his *Condensed Novels*, burlesqued the style of Cooper's

novels by making "the judge" say to his daughter: "Ginevra, the logs which compose yonder fire seem to have been incautiously chosen. The sibilation produced by the sap, which exudes copiously therefrom, is not conducive to composition." And the fair Ginevra replies: "I see, father, but I thought it would be preferable to the constant crepitation which is apt to attend the combustion of more seasoned ligneous fragments." But our author says truly that a page of Cooper is worth volumes of such triflers as Le Gallienne, Oscar Wilde, and others of that ilk. Cooper has the stalwart vigor of the pure open air, and they have the sickly debility of a stuffy artificial modernity. Cooper's account of the Battle of Bunker Hill in *Lionel Lincoln* is brilliant, and *The Deerslayer*, with all its imperfections, appeals to the lover of robust adventure and of the beautiful in nature, to every healthy sound-minded man who has rich, good blood in his veins. Thackeray said Montaigne's *Essays* were one of his bedside books: "I read them in the dozy hours and only half remember them." Macaulay said, "Some books which I would never dream of opening at dinner please me at breakfast, and *vice versa*." Our author prefers "Ella at bedtime, Thackeray in the afternoon, with an installment of Dickens in the bright, clear morning, and perhaps De Quincey, Holmes, or Lowell at noon." He does not know when he would appropriate time for Henry James or Mrs. Humphry Ward, but thinks they might be of some value in a period of insomnia. Edmond Scherer said: "A cult once established, a dogma once accepted—then no more freedom of analysis, no more independent criticism, no more permissible dissent; nothing but to admire like a dumb beast." Critics and reviewers catch it frequently from authors. This author credits them with usually meaning to be just and fair, but thinks they often miss the mark. Disraeli said critics are men who have failed in literature and art. Coleridge said: "Reviewers are usually people who would have been poets, historians, biographers if they could." Shelley said: "Reviewers, with rare exceptions, are a stupid and malignant race." Southey once enticed Shelley into his study and read his (Southey's) own verses to him till the listener fell asleep under the table. Tennyson once read aloud to Charles Sumner the whole of "The Princess" at one sitting; and Sumner never dared visit the laureate again for fear of a similar infliction, though the Massachusetts senator was sometimes an egotistic bore himself. Of Wagner's "Tannhäuser" Prosper Mérimée said: "It is a prodigious, a colossal bore. I am convinced that I could compose something similar if inspired by the scampering of my cat over the piano keys." Mr. Joline says he has had a strange affection for Carlyle since reading how his wife scolded him for feeding the cat at the table. He says Charles Dickens was a born actor, whose daily life always suggested the footlights. When Horace Walpole was suffering from the gout Gray, of the "Elegy," wrote him: "The pain in your feet I can bear." Such heartlessness saddens the souls of those who wish to believe in the brotherhood of man. Bill Nye said of the *Century Dictionary*: "I like it immensely. It is quite thrilling in places, and although somewhat jerky in style and verbose, perhaps, its word-painting is accurate and delightful." Our author refuses to abase himself before Louis Stevenson or

Walter Pater as models or authorities in literary style. Pater lacks simplicity and freshness, loses the natural in devotion to the formal, and is a dispenser of literary millinery. Pater says: "Racy Saxon monosyllables, close to us as touch and sight, intermix readily with those long savor-some Latin words rich in 'second intention.'" But Mr. Joline says that when a writer pauses to bethink himself of his Saxon monosyllables and savor-some Latin words he loses spontaneity, becomes a specimen of affectation, devoid of soul and animation. The secret of forcible style is to write simply, clearly, directly, after the straight fashion in which men talk to their fellows. Flaubert is a master of form, but lacks strength, heartiness, and vitality. Even Pater insists that a man's style should be his own and not borrowed. Thus he says: "Style in all its varieties, reserved or opulent, terse, abundant, musical, stimulant, or academic, finds justification so long as it is really characteristic; the sumptuous good taste of Cicero being as truly the man himself as would have been his portrait by Raffaele in full consular splendor, in his ivory chair." Mr. Gosse says of Pater: "He exhausted himself in the research after absolute perfection of expression, noting with extreme refinement delicate shades of feeling and exquisite distinctions of thought and sentiment. His fault was to overburden his sentences, to annex to them too many parenthetical clauses and adjectival glosses. He was the most studied of all the English prose writers of his time." Mr. Joline regards Pater as a melancholy monument of mistaken mannerism, who has no hold upon men. It may be so. Doubtless there is an over-preciseness in Pater's style, an excess of polish; nevertheless we cannot help admiring and revering the man who aims at perfection and toils hard to attain it. Whatever his misconceptions or practical mistakes, his nature is noble, the blood-royal is in his veins, he is worthy of a crown. Our author speaks of Andrew Lang as "the eminent Panjandrum of literature." Coleridge accused Gibbon of having reduced history to a mere collection of splendid anecdotes. Dean Stanley said to J. R. Green, the historian: "I see you are in danger of becoming picturesque. Beware of it. I have suffered from it." Goethe said of Byron: "There is no padding in his poetry." There is no padding in Green's historical work. He is more valuable than Stubbs or Freeman. His *Short History of the English People* created such a furor that fashionable ladies carried it about with them on their visits to country houses. With these and similar desultory and diverting bits of quotation, anecdote, opinion, and reminiscence, the author of *Meditations of an Autograph Collector*, previously noticed here, has filled over three hundred mildly interesting pages.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Representative Modern Preachers. By LEWIS O. BRASTOW, D.D., Professor of Practical Theology in Yale University. 12mo, pp. 423. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

A difficult and delicate task in preparing a work on *Representative Modern Preachers* is the selection for consideration of a few out of a

great multitude who belong to this class. In turning the pages of this work we miss the names of colossal preachers who have stood in the modern pulpit conspicuous types of their class. It is remarkable that the Methodist pulpit, which has been distinguished for its eloquence and effectiveness, has not a single name in this "Hall of Fame." Surely Bishop Simpson merits a place in that goodly company. The book is a portraiture of nine representative preachers: Schleiermacher, Robertson, Beecher, Bushnell, Phillips Brooks, Cardinal Newman, Mozley, Guthrie, and Spurgeon. The author discusses these nine with critical discrimination. Unlike many biographers who read themselves into the characters they study, he has the rare gift of subtle intuition by which he penetrates the most diverse natures, thinking their thoughts, participating in their motives, feeling all, living all. So they move before us as living beings with no suggestion of mechanism worked by the professor's hand. We do not object to the evident sympathy with the persons he portrays; for we believe that love rather than passionless criticism is the truer interpreter of character; excepting where love becomes an enchantment, a sort of hypnotic spell, in which black appears white, and deformity is grace itself. In only a single instance do these studies awaken a suspicion of any obscuration of facts by the glare of love; they rather impress us that they were written with the calm impartiality of a loving though disenchanted critic. The single exception is that of Cardinal Newman. The author discounts about every charge that critics such as Kingsley, Rigg, and Newman's own brother have made against him. "Whatever may be the final verdict as to the value of Newman's work, and whatever our estimate of the rationality of his principles and the sanity of his methods, . . . that his motives were at bottom other than sincerely religious will not be readily credited by any man who has ever felt the power of his passionately earnest soul." That certainly seems to be the general judgment of this singularly fascinating personality. And there is probably no true man who would take any pleasure in pointing out a single defect in the venerable figure whom all classes of whatever sect love to honor. He was unquestionably a man of brilliant genius; a poet born and original whose songs will make music through the ages; an exquisite writer of English prose; a preacher of marvelous insight into character and extraordinary power of persuasion; a man of stupendous achievements and high ecclesiastical rank; and one who could win, not only those who knew him at a distance, but also those who were near to him, to a reverence which is hardly distinguishable from worship. Nor was his "spell" in any appreciable measure weakened by his removal from the English Church to that of Rome. We stand too near the sepulcher of this great man to enter any demurrer at this time to the general hero-worship. But we do think that in a critical estimate of Newman as a preacher the fact ought to be specially noted that his ablest sermons were preached while he was in the Anglican pulpit. That at least is the judgment of many who have studied them. There was indeed "a sudden freedom and spontaneity of movement which characterized his discourses immediately after his entering Rome," which did not appear in his earlier

sermons; but as Gladstone suggests, whom our author quotes, that was probably due to the fact that he was "unmuzzled." In other respects the earlier sermons were the stronger. His admiring biographer Hutton presents at length his ministry at St. Mary's as superior in every quality of a preacher to his later ministry at Birmingham. Another fact ought to be strongly emphasized in order to explain Newman's career; namely, his want of historic insight. Hutton says: "The ultimate basis of Newman's theology was feeling; that of Döllinger was history. For this reason he and Döllinger could not get on together. The cardinal said, It was like a dog and a fish trying to make friends." Professor Brastow does indeed recognize this fact and says that Newman was afraid of the free application of the methods of historic criticism in dogma. But it is our impression that it was something more than fear that led him to such utter perversion of history at times, as when he defends the Roman Church from the charge of persecution in such language as this: "Rome has been a never-failing fount of humanity, equity, forbearance, and compassion. We find in all parts of Europe scaffolds prepared to punish crimes against religion; scenes which sadden the soul were everywhere witnessed; Rome is the one exception to the rule. The popes, armed with the tribunal of intolerance, have scarce spilt a drop of blood; Protestants and philosophers have shed it in torrents!" History indeed! It is well for us not to allow the splendor of genius and charming personality to blind us to serious defects. One of the most powerfully drawn pictures in this gallery and one that must satisfy the most critical observer is that of Schleiermacher. While no one man can be said to have occasioned and directed the rebound of the German heart from the deadening rationalism of the eighteenth century, it is certain that the reactionary movement toward a new spiritual life in dogma and experience found in Schleiermacher its most conspicuous and influential representative. In the judgment of our author, Neander, McClintock, and others he received from his early Moravian training "a spirit of tender subjective religiousness which ever lingered like a heavenly aroma over everything which he wrote and spoke." He, like all true prophets, saw that behind all creeds, all ecclesiastical pageantries, all ethical rules, and all philosophies there was an eternal True, a spirit divine, whose breath would awaken life in the individual, the Church, the school, the nation. To preach that was the work of his life. His was a voice in the wilderness which startled the torpid conscience of German university and pulpit. It is to Schleiermacher more than to any one man of the century that we owe the popular distinction between religion and doctrine which is so mightily affecting the modern pulpit. Doctrine is the result of the effort to formulate in thought that which is deeper and wider than all human thinking. Taking his dictum that "religion is feeling," then the basal facts of all religion are those revealed in Christian consciousness: not that of one man, but "the collective Christian consciousness is the ultimate test of Christian truth." Hence the value of creeds, ecclesiastical symbols, and even the apostolic testimony is not that they are an absolute objective authority, but only in the fact that they express the facts of Christian consciousness

at a given time. We can readily see how that this principle, when pursued to its logical end, will not only exclude all speculations on religious life, but also all authoritative statements of it; a position which the life of the Church has demonstrated as untenable. It is certain that as piety fruits in truth, so truth feeds piety. His conception of religion as natural, belonging as it does to the constitution of the human soul, and as supernatural in having its inspiring source in God who is revealed in Christ, is also influencing the modern pulpit. It helps to bridge the gulf between the natural and the supernatural. The supernatural itself has an element of naturalness. Furthermore Schleiermacher's spirituality so unlike the ascetic type of Rome, and the merely emotional type of certain evangelistic schools, demands a practical thorough moral life. "His system has developed the ethical side of Christian life more fully than it had ever been developed before and has made to it the most important contribution of the last century." Of the other preachers presented in this volume, Robertson, "the most gifted preacher of his century," and Beecher, "the most brilliant of American preachers," are both "path-breakers in the work of the Christian pulpit, and may be classed as epoch-making men in modern preaching." Guthrie and Spurgeon "have contributed little or nothing to the thought of the Church, and the up-to-date man is interested in neither, yet it would be a mistake to minimize their significance for the practical life of the Church." Bushnell, with "homiletical genius," personality, and doctrine, and Phillips Brooks, "the great humanist of his generation," have already won and "will continue to win the moral and spiritual allegiance of men."

History of the Christian Church. By GEORGE H. DRYER, D.D. 12mo. Vol. I, Beginning of the Kingdom, pp. 415; Vol. II, The Preparation for Modern Times, 600-1517 A. D., pp. 642; Vol. III, The Reformation, 1517-1648 A. D., pp. 633; Vol. IV, The Puritan Reform and the Evangelical Revival, 1648-1800 A. D., pp. 606; Vol. V, The Advance of Christendom, 1800-1901 A. D., pp. 730. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. New York: Eaton & Mains. Price, cloth, \$7.50.

With the author's estimate as to the value of Christian history all readers of these volumes will at the outset agree. A just confidence in the authority of the Church and an enthusiastic belief in its glorious destiny are without doubt conditioned upon a knowledge of its origin. With this conviction as a starting point—and it must be the inspiring conviction of every historian who is worthy of the name and who does work that survives—Dr. Dryer has written the volumes which are now before us. The mention of several evident characteristics of his work, as they impress the reviewer, will perhaps give a sufficient understanding of his methods and his purpose. It goes without the saying, for instance, that his plan is elaborately comprehensive. It is a far step from the times of the flourishing, but pagan and decadent, Roman empire to the opening of the twentieth century. The long ages that intervene are not those of inactivity. They ring with the hymns of early worshipers in the catacombs, the voices of disputants in the great councils, the tread of armies enlisted in religious wars, the anathemas of popes and the defiance of reformers, the impassioned words of evangelists and the cry of the multitudes for salvation.

Only a patient and brave historian would essay the task of sweeping so large a field. We cannot wonder at the statement which is made by Dr. Dryer that he has spent years in the preparation of his volumes. Incidentally to turn his pages is to realize his herculean labor. Nor has he written in the narrow spirit of a mere compiler of historic data. But, with the synthetic instinct of the true philosopher, he relates the secular to the religious and finds a close and vital connection between the first and the second. So it is that, intermixed with the events directly relating to the growth of the Church, we sometimes find the description of the existing social and governmental conditions which have prevailed in the successive ages; or, sometimes, the enumeration of those movements in literature, in the arts and sciences, and in discovery which have enriched human life; or, sometimes, the names of the great world leaders whose deeds are immortal. Choosing at random, the reader discovers the mention of the social fabric of Rome, with its aristocracy and its slaves; the portrayal of the fascinating Elizabethan reign; the thrilling story of the Puritans; and the last "political and social progress of Great Britain." Here is told at length the story of the Renaissance, with references to Angelo, Dante, Petrarch, and more. Here the caravels of Columbus move across the sea; here Copernicus and Galileo sweep the heavens; here great inventions are catalogued, from that of printing, in the fifteenth century, to that of the telephone, at the close of the nineteenth. And here such literary lights as Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Bacon, with many others, shed their luster on the scene. So that we forget, for a moment, that we are turning volumes of Church history, and seem rather to be wandering in the enchanting fields of history general. And yet these digressions are the means to an important end; and by them the settings of the great religious movements Dr. Dryer describes are made more distinct. A third characteristic of these volumes is therefore their vivid quality. "To read history," the author in one instance says among his advices, "read it first as you would a novel." In this spirit he has made his pages interesting for his readers. None of them are dull, while at times he has vitalized the scene and caused the past to throb with life. In his chapter entitled "Pictures from Mediæval Life," for instance, he draws this sketch of the English peasant on a beautiful morning in June: "He looks toward the parish church as the bell strikes the hour of prayer, and he vaguely feels all Christians pray together then. He feels that the church is his; about it lie buried his kindred of the generations gone; its service and festivals break the narrow round of his daily life; it brings thoughts of a better life beyond this, if also of terror for his sins and dread of purgatory. In the great hours of his family life, in marriage and baptism, in sickness and death, at any time of distress, he feels he has the right to the service and sympathy of the priest, who can bring something of the infinite power of God and comfort of Holy Mother Church to his heart and life." And so it is that the narrative is always attractive, and sometimes takes on the character of the enchanting. It is important to state that the last three volumes are devoted to the discussion of the modern Church. With the fifth, which opens with the

tragedies of the French Revolution, we begin to breathe the air of recent times. A mention of some of the chapters in this closing volume will show its important character. They include "The Evangelical Church in Germany," in which Dr. Dryer traces the work of many conspicuous scholars of that land and describes the work of Higher Criticism; "The Evangelical Church in Great Britain and Ireland;" "The Christian Church in the United States," covering its development in the last fifty years of the nineteenth century, and including matter that is encyclopædic; "Eastern Christendom;" "Outer Christendom," or the present mission fields of the Church; and "Characteristics and Tendencies." Among the last, he holds, are the movement toward organic union—as seen in the Presbyterian Churches of the United States and the Methodist bodies of Canada and Australia—and that for "the Christian conquest of the world." On this he writes: "Compare the position of the Christian Church at the beginning of Napoleon's consulate and at the death of Queen Victoria, and there is no other contrast in the history of the century so striking and so significant. To the high service of this purpose have come all revision of creeds and liturgies, and searching criticism of the Bible text and authorship. Christians bring a better Bible, a more united and better Church, than ever before to the non-Christian millions of the world. What will not serve this purpose must soon drop away. Our Lord shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." And so this volume closes in that spirit of Christian optimism which expects nothing less than the universal dominion of the Church of Christ, and which prays, "Thy kingdom come." Of other general characteristics of these books it is not now possible to speak—including the generally impartial spirit in which Dr. Dryer has discussed all phases of his theme; or the voluminous citations of "Literature" found in each work and evidencing the wide research of the author in different languages and lands. To write a "popular history of the Christian Church"—in harmony with a long conviction of its need—has been the author's purpose. A purpose fully accomplished.

A Short History of Ancient Peoples. By ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.A., D.C.L. With an Introduction by the Rev. A. H. SAYCE, M.A., D.D., Professor of Assyriology at Oxford. Large 8vo, pp. xxi, 728. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Price, cloth, \$3.

The wide range of this volume may be indicated by a summary list of the peoples whose history is comprised within it. In the order in which they stand in the book they are as follows: Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Medes and Persians, Hebrews, Phœnicia, Carthage, Greece, Rome. The history begins with the early kings of Egypt who are apparently (the author is not very definite) dated about 4000 B. C., and it concludes with the Emperor Augustus at A. D. 14, and with these words: "We have now carried the history of Rome over a period of eight centuries. We have seen the hamlet develop into a village, the village into a town, the town into a great city, the city into a mighty empire. We have watched also the process of political development, the patriarchal community, the monarchy, the republic, and now the rule of the one man, autocrat in all but name. The scheme of the present work renders it impossible to

carry the narrative farther here. The Roman empire continued to influence the world, and to be of high importance for centuries. It even extended its boundaries in certain directions before it began to decline, and at last to fall. But the interesting story of its grandeur and decay must be left for another volume." The book is admirably written, the style is dignified and worthy, and betokens the man of fine culture and wide reading. It is interesting withal, nay, even entertaining, and many would find it a very useful introduction to that wonderful ancient world, of which even the fairly well educated know so sadly little. The only safe guide for the future is the past, and if our break with the past be sharp we shall readily become the prey of the demagogue. How few are the allusions to the great leaders and great historic movements of other ages and climes found in current American newspapers! And who shall deny that the editors are right in the judgment that few of their readers would comprehend them? For the many who need to learn the simplest facts about the general movements of the past we may commend this work, but with the keen regret that we can give it no higher praise. At the very first glance the book awakens suspicion of the author's acquaintance with the literature of his subject. The List of Authorities is printed on pages xxiii and xxiv, and a sorry list it is. The first surprising lack to be observed is that not one single book in French or German is mentioned. It puzzles us to comprehend how any man could possibly assume to guide others who did not himself know the leaders in his subject. It is idle to dispute that some of the greatest historical work of modern times has been done in Germany. We have no right to ask Dr. Souttar to produce an historical work based on original sources. He was not planning to do that, and there is always room for the skillful and learned popularizer. But we may rightly insist that the popularizer shall command at least the literature of his subject in German and French. Dr. Souttar ought to have had by him Eduard Meyer's *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Maspero's *Contes populaires de l'Egypte ancienne*, W. Max Müller's *Die Liebes Poesie der alten Ägypter*, Meyer's *Geschichte des alten Ägypten*, W. Max Müller's *Asien und Europa*, Erman's *Ägypten*, Hommel's, Tiele's, and Winckler's *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichten*, and so on through scores of volumes dealing not only with the Orient but with Greece and Rome. But to make the case much worse, Dr. Souttar does not use the latest material in English. Where is Holm's *History of Greece*, Rogers's *Babylonia and Assyria*, Kent's and Ottley's *Histories of the Hebrews*, Petrie's *History of Egypt* (Budge's *History of Egypt* probably appeared too recently), Winckler's *El-Amarna Letters*, Wellhausen's *History of Israel*, Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, and so on indefinitely? The English-speaking peoples are long-suffering indeed, but their patience ought long since to have been exhausted by the appearance of books written by men who had made no pretense to know the latest word of exact scholarship. This lack of acquaintance with recent literature has vitiated what might otherwise have been an admirable book. The author has the skill of a ready writer, he has imagination, and he has a persuasive manner. But the book has errors and careless statements a-plenty. Here are

a few specimens: "When Callisthenes visited Babylon in the train of Alexander the Great, he found and sent home to Aristotle copies of astronomical observations and calculations dating from B. C. 2000" (p. 80). Now Simplicius asserts that Callisthenes found observations extending back 31,000 years! Lehmann tries to show that they really go back only to 2233 B. C., but this rests on a supposed error in a translation and we have no proof of it. This is a fair specimen of many loose and inaccurate statements in the book. Karak (p. 85), according to modern reading, ought to be Isin. Ramman-nirari III (p. 89) is now called Adad-nirari III. "The Sabbath was observed by both Assyrians and Babylonians as a day of rest, on the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days of the lunar month" (p. 111). Perhaps there is some truth in this, but it is not yet proved. We have the "Sabbath" Calendar for only two months in the year, namely, Elul and Marcheshwan, and in that calendar the nineteenth day is also included. We do not know whether this *Sabbatu* ran through the year or not, and if Dr. Souttar were an accurate and painstaking student he would never have spoken in such cheerful carelessness. On page 115 there is mentioned a King Tiglath-Bir I. This is the king who is called in all recent books Tukulti-Ninib; the former reading is used apparently by nobody but Professor Sayce, and if Dr. Souttar chose to follow his reading he ought at least to have given the alternate reading used by all other modern scholars. The name Rimmon occurs frequently in Dr. Souttar's pages, and this also is due to Professor Sayce, for other scholars have used the form Ramman until quite recent times, when they have all abandoned it for Adad, and Professor Sayce now uses Hadad (see his Gifford Lectures). "Ethbaal was king of Tyre when Phœnicia came into conflict with Assyria" (p. 283), but the Old Testament quite clearly calls him the king of Sidon (1 Kings xvi, 31), and there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of this statement. He became ruler practically of all Phœnicia, and from Menander Dr. Souttar must have derived the word "Tyre." "The date of the founding of Carthage is generally placed a century before that of Rome [i. e., 853 B. C.], and this is probably as good an approximation as we need desire in a matter so indefinite" (p. 307). But Timæus and Menander place the founding of Carthage in 814-3, during the reign of Pygmalion, and this ought to have been stated, instead of the loose mention which we have quoted. Such inaccurate, indefinite, or erroneous statements might be multiplied indefinitely, and a book thus written can hardly be commended without much misgiving. The book was printed at the Aberdeen University Press, which is the same thing as saying that it is exceedingly well printed, and though bulky it is light and not inconvenient to handle.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Sunday Talks on Nature Topics. By D. A. JORDAN, D.D. 12mo, pp. 133. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

These are short talks from the pulpit to children and youth. They are adapted to awaken and hold the interested attention of the young, to

instruct in many of the facts and processes of nature, using those facts in a way to suggest various valuable moral lessons. The *Talks* tell the story of how the world came to be, and how the soil was made, and what sort of workmen God employed to crush the rocks into soil and pulverize it and plow it and get it ready to bring forth crops of all kinds. They tell of seeds and how they are scattered and planted by winds and birds and squirrels and rabbits; of the wonders of growth, its power and its conditions; of harvest, enforcing the lesson that we will reap what we sow; of frost and snow and the beauty of snow-crystals and the use of snow and glaciers and icebergs; of clouds and fogs and vapors and rain; and of quaint Easter customs, with the meaning of Easter. All these wonders of Nature, described in terms intelligible to children, are made to fix spiritual lessons in young minds. The simple picture-illustrations serve to make the *Talks* still plainer. Dr. Jordan believes with Horace Bushnell that it is our privilege and duty, as preachers of Christ, to do more preaching to children. For years he has practiced on this conviction with eminent success. In this little book he presents some of the pulpit talks which have made his ministry attractive and edifying to the young. The progress of child-study in our day renders it probable that we shall have an increase of this sort of preaching in the near future. To have no children in our pews is wrong. To have them there, but understanding nothing of what the preacher says, is not ideal. To make them like to be there is a triumph. Often the children listen to us with the feeling expressed by a seven-year-old girl who went across the street one morning to look at an Annual Conference which was in session in her church. She soon returned home, explaining to her mother, "They all talked great big grown-up things, so I comed away." That little girl is now a missionary in India.

The Illustrative Lesson Notes for 1904. By Thomas B. Neely, D.D., LL.D., assisted by Robert R. Doherty, Ph.D., and Rev. Henry H. Meyer, A.M. 8vo. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

In the preparation of this standard annual unusual care has been taken. For a quarter of a century the "Illustrative Notes" have enriched the libraries of Sunday school workers with their treasures of knowledge. While no amount of aid can render less imperative the necessity of studying God's word "without note or comment," yet such helps as this volume affords are of inestimable value to the most diligent students of the Scriptures. The treasures of the standard commentaries, exegetical, homiletical, and practical, in condensed form are here presented. In addition thereto hundreds of maps, pictorial illustrations, and blackboard diagrams render the exposition of the lessons by both teachers and reviewers at once easy and interesting. The volume is indispensable not only to teachers, but likewise to advanced students of the word in Bible classes. Privileged indeed are these workers, since concerning them it may be affirmed, "Other men labored, and ye are entered into their labors."

